Commentary VII

[VII.1–17 JPB]

VII.1 Agni [SJ on JPB]

As the publ. intro. indicates, the hymn repeatedly refers to both *náraḥ* '(superior) men' and *vīrá-*, the former esp. as ritual performers. (As it turns out, the publ. intro. fails to list all the occurrences of each: there are two more of *vīrá-* (4, 21) and one more of *nṛ́-* (21). Though JPB seems to consider the terms as essentially synonymous here, or at least coreferential ("do not appear to be different people"), I think they are contrastive and would prefer to render the latter as 'hero', as usual. For one thing, though, as the publ. intro. indicates, each stem appears multiple times in the hymn, there are significant differences in form. All but one of the six occurrences of *nṛ́-* are independent plural nouns: nom. *náraḥ* (4x: 1, 4, 9, 10), gen. *nṛ́ṇām* (1x: 11), with only *nárya-* in 21 a derivative; whereas only two of the seven occurrences of *vīrá-* are independent forms, nom. pl. *vīrā́ḥ* (15), nom. sg. *vīráḥ* (21), with the other five in cmpds: *suvī́ra-* (3x: 4, 5, 24), *avī́ratā-* (2x: 11, 19). Thus the *náraḥ* appear to be immediately present to the poet (even when they are figures of the past, as in 9), while the *vīrá-* are distanced: what we aspire to possess and fear the lack of. Unlike the *náraḥ*, whose role in ritual is emphasized (esp. vss. 1, 4, 9, prob. 10, 11), *vīrá-* has no connection to the ritual, save possibly in 15, though I do not interpr. it that way there.

As JPB points out, the hymn has two identical endings (vs. 20 = 25), each concluding with the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain. It also is divided into two parts by meter: Virāj 1–18, Triṣṭubh 19–25. What is curious is that these two divisions don't mesh.

The hymn also has a remarkable number of *mā́* prohibitives, esp. in its 2nd part: 11 (2x), 19 (6x), 21 (2x), 22 (2x).

An emended tr. of the whole hymn is given at the end of the comments on the individual vss. of the hymn.

VII.1.1: I would slightly emend the tr. of the 1st pāda from "our men" to simply "the men." That they belong to our ritual circle is presumably the case, but "our" seems more insistent than the text supports.

I also think *dī́dhiti-* is something more pointed than 'insight' – rather 'visionary power' or 'visionary hymn': the power that gives poets to discern deep truths and the product of this discernment. See esp. III.31.1, IX.102.1[=8] *ṛtásya dī́dhiti-* "the visionary power of truth." I would substitute here "with their visionary powers and the motion of their hands."

The publ. tr. of the transition from b to c is unintentionally ambiguous: "to him who is proclaimed, / to the flaming houselord" can be read with the "to the ... houselord" (c) as the recipient of the proclamation in b. In both b and c I would delete the "to."

atharyú- is a famous crux, with multiple interpr. See esp. Old's extensive discussion (which, however, is esp. concerned with *atharī́-* in IV.6.8, q.v.). Here and for *atharvī́-* in I.112.10 I accept KH's suggestion (Nachtr. EWA I.805) that it's based on a root-noun cmpd *$*h_2$at-$h_2$ar-* 'Wanderweg' – though I don't connect *atharī́-* with these words, for both semantic and morphological reasons (see comm. ad IV.6.8). Here 'seeking the way' would refer to the ritual cursus. In this sense *athar-* is semantically quite close to

(near-rhyming) *adhvar-*, the *-ar*-form to the original *r* / *n* heteroclite found in *ádhvan-* 'way', with *adhvará-* referring to the ceremonial course and then to the ceremony itself.

Putting these various changes together I would tr. the vs.:

"The men gave birth to Agni in the two fire-churning sticks, by their visionary powers and the motion of their hands—the one proclaimed,

the houselord, visible from far, seeking the way."

VII.1.2: The parcelling out of the separate bits in the publ. tr. seems a bit clumsy – a full retranslation of the vs. is given below, with some lexical substitutions.

I would substitute "the good ones" for "the good (gods)." These are indeed quite likely the Vasus or some subset of gods, but I would prefer to keep it less definite.

The two locc. *asté* (a) and *dáme* (c) both mean 'home, house'; here I'm assuming that the first refers to Agni's home, that is a fireplace, and the latter to the house of the worshiper. There may be some interplay between *asté* and *kútaś cit* in the next pāda: Agni's home is the hearth in any sacrificer's house; there is not a single *astá-* from that point of view, and therefore in whatever place he is he should provide help. It is the gods that establish the various fires in the various fireplaces of the devout. But in pāda c the focus is on the house of a particular mortal worshiper.

On *dakṣā́yya-* see comm. esp. ad I.91.3, where I opt for "whose skill is to be sought." Although the rendering "to be skillfully tended" found in the publ. tr. works here and for the other Agni passage (II.4.3), it is less applicable to the other gods so characterized. Here, since the purpose of Agni's installation was just given -- to give help – my interpr. of *dakṣā́yya-* fits well. Note also that Agni is called *sudákṣa-* in 6a.

Unlike all the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr., but not WG), which tr. *dakṣā́yyaḥ* outside the rel. cl., I take it as not only inside that cl. (the position of *yáḥ* of course allows this) but also as its predicate. For *dakṣā́yyaḥ ... dáme* see also II.4.3.

I would like for *ā́sa nítyaḥ* to be a timeless habitual "is constantly' (or perhaps 'has been constantly'), though this might be an ad hoc reading. I haven't found other such passages with the perfect in that sense. The stem *nítya-* occurs three times elsewhere in this hymn, 12a, 17b, 21c; in all four passages both senses of *nítya-*, 'own' and 'constant, regular, stable', are (or can be) in play. See comm. ad locc.; on the senses of *nítya-* see comm. ad X.44.1.

The emended tr.:

"The good ones installed Agni in his home [=fireplace], him of lovely gaze, for his help wherever (his home might be),

(as the one) who is constantly [/has constantly been] to be besought for his skill in the (sacrificer's) house as (his/its) own (fire)."

VII.1.3: The impv. *dīdihi* plays off the noun *dī́dhiti-* in 1a – two different roots of course. The impv. here is a metrical mess, managing in just three syllables to produce both an irregular late break (H / H L) and a bad cadence (L L H X). This form usually appears pāda-final, usually in dimeter vs., but sometimes in Jagatī (in both places allowing a good cadence), whereas its companion impv. *didīhi* is generally found final in Triṣṭubh (as in vs. 21b below), again producing a good cadence. See comm. ad IX.108.9. Here all would have been well if the pāda ended after the impv. – as a well-formed 8-syl. pāda with a complete thought -- without the afterthought three-syll. *puró naḥ*. Substituting **didīhi*

would not have helped. In order to signal the near identity of *dīdihi* here and *didīhi* in 21, I have added "brightly" here.

The standard tr. seem to envision the fem. phrase *ájasrayā sūrmyā̆* as qualifying something solid: a pillar (Ge/WG Feuersäule), a column (Re colonne-de-feu), a tube (EWA Röhre), a shaft (publ. tr.); for further suggestions see Ge's n. 3a. But since the likely analysis and etym. of *sūrmí-* is *su-ūrmí-* 'having lovely waves' (see EWA s.v.), an analysis favored by the likely distracted reading *s"ūrm'yā* (despite producing a less favored break), why not something pulsing or undulating? (This is of course easier to imagine after the advent of modern physics, which, however, was available to all the translators listed, since the wave model of light goes back to the 17 c.) I would substitute "with your inexhaustible, beautifully undulating wave (of light)."

VII.1.4: A more complex and elaborated version of this vs. is found in 14.

I would insert the definite article and change the supplied possessive "(others')" to "(other)" on the basis of 14a: "better than the (other) fires."

The verbal lexeme of the first hemistich is generally taken to be *prá níḥ √śuc* (so Gr, Schaef. 193–94), but neither *prá níḥ √śuc* nor *níḥ √śuc* is found anywhere else in Skt. that I can find, and the position of *níḥ* at the end of the pāda, distant from both *prá* and *śośucanta*, is peculiar. There are two other pāda-final exx. of *níḥ*. In II.11.9 it immediately follows its verb ... *asphuran níḥ*, a regular landing site for preverbs in tmesis. But in I.118.8 the verb opens the pāda, and, crucially, *níḥ* immediately follows an ablative, which it governs: *ámuñcatam vártikām áṃhaso níḥ* "You released the quail-hen from tight straits." I suggest that it also serves as postposition with the abl. *agníbhyaḥ* here, in conjunction with and reinforcing *váram* 'better'. It is therefore unconnected with the verb *prá ... śośucanta*. (No change is nec. in the publ. tr.)

The intens. would be better rendered "keep blazing forth" vel sim. This would continue the habitual expressions found in 2c (as I interpr. it) and 3c. Schaef (194) takes *śośucanta* as a subjunctive because of the impv. *dīdihi* in 3a, but surely more relevant is the indic. present *samā̆sate* in pāda c of this vs., which is dependent on this main clause. I see no reason not to take it a presential injunctive – though nothing actually rules out a subjunctive interpr.

I would replace "abounding in good men" with "abounding in good heroes," to contrast *-vī́ra-* with *náraḥ* in c.

Again, I would replace "our" with "the"; see 1a. Note that the ritual work of the *náraḥ* is emphasized here, while the *vīrá-* are (hopefully) possessed, and distributed, by the fires.

VII.1.5: The publ. tr. has to be emended, because *svapatyá-* is an adj., not a noun (*pace* the publ. tr.'s "a good lineage"), as it also is in 12b. It frequently modifies *rayí-* (see, e.g., II.2.12, 4.8). As in the preceding vs. I would also change "good men" to "heroes." Substitute "give us wealth that abounds in good heroes and good descendants."

Contra Ge (n. 5c) and Re (explicitly), but with the publ. tr. and WG, I take *yā̆van-* (nom. sg. *yā̆vā*) as a deriv. of *√yā* 'drive'. It clearly was chosen for its echo of *yātumā̆vān* at the end of the pāda. On that curious stem, see comm. ad VII.104.3.

VII.1.7: On Jarūtha see comm. ad X.80.3.

I would tr. *prá ... cātayasva* somewhat more forcefully, as 'banish' or 'drive into hiding' (as in V.4.6)

VII.1.8–9: These two vss. are responsive, though with subtle differences. Given their location in the Virāj portion of the hymn (vss. 1–18) – not quite halfway -- they almost are in omphalos position, but they do not seem to be encoding an enigma – though the message that the actions of ritualists both in the present and in the past enable Agni's benevolence to us in the here and now encapsulates the theme of the vertical and horizontal nexus of ritualists prominent in the hymn. Moreover, vs. 9 may "repair" a syntactic problem (or two) in vs. 8. See below. The responsive portions are found in pādas a and c:

8a *ā́ yás te agne idhaté ánīkam*
9a *ví yé te agne bhejiré ánīkam*

with the only differences being the initial preverb and the verb (incl. tense/mood);

8c *utó na ebhî staváthair ihá syāḥ*
9c *utó na ebhíḥ sumánā ihá syāḥ*

with the only difference being instr. *staváthaiḥ* versus nom. *sumánā(ḥ)*. The former is a hapax.

There are several issues to address in this verse pair. On the one hand, there is no overt correlative in the main cl. for the rel. *yáḥ* in vs. 8, while vs. 9 may – or may not – have a correlative to *yé*. See treatment below.

There is also the question of the function of *utó* (= *utá* + *u*) in the c pādas of both vss. I will deal with this issue first. We definitely do not expect the coordinating conjunction *utá* to "conjoin" a relative cl. with its main cl. Since it occupies that apparent position in both vss., a different explanation has to be sought for it. The consensus seems to be that it means "also" – so the publ. tr. and JSK (DGRV I.449) = "auch" Ge and WG. (Re just seems to ignore the *utó*-s.) But "also" in addition to *what*? The position of "also" in the publ. tr. – 8c: "because of these praise songs (of his) <u>also</u> you should be here for us"; 9c: "because of these <u>also</u> you should be favorable here to us" — seems to indicate that what's being added is whatever the instr. is expressing. In 8 this would be the praise songs, in addition to the kindling of pāda a? in 9 the previous ritualists (of 1b) contrasted with us? None of this is either clear or compelling. JSK argues that the *utá* "focuses on the adjacent *naḥ*" and tr. both instances as "also for us" – contrasted, I suppose, with the subjects of the rel. clauses, both the present ritualist (*yá indhaté*) and those in the past (*yé bhejiré*). This also seems the solution of Ge and WG ("auch uns"). But I still find this unsatisfactory, esp. since I think we should limit (or eliminate) supposed instances of 'also' for *utá*. The solution (or, I suppose, *a* solution) seems much simpler. In addition to single *utá*, the conjunction often occurs in pairs, *utá ... utá*, conjoining, among other things, parallel clauses (see JSK, DGRV I.409ff.). In this set of paired vss., with almost identical main clauses, that interpr. seems clear (to me anyway): "<u>both</u> be there for us [under the conditions given in the rel. cl. 8a] <u>and</u> be favorable to us [under the conditions given in the other rel. cl. 9ab]." The *utá*-s conjoin syntactically parallel entities, as they should, and the meaning of this conjunction does not have to be twisted. This is difficult to render in English, but I am tolerably certain that it's the right solution – the pattern imposes it -- or at least a more likely one than those given so far.

As for the correlative issue mentioned above: in vs. 8 there is no overt representation in pāda c of a correspondent to sg. *yáḥ* in pāda a. In the publ. tr. one is supplied as parenthetical "(of his)" dependent on "these praise songs" (*ebhí staváthaiḥ*). Ge (n. 8c) claims that *ebhíḥ* is "attraction" for *asya* (sim. Re *ebhíḥ* as "indirect correlative" of *yáḥ* ; JSK DGRV I.449 "*ebhíḥ* is equivalent in meaning to *asya*"), but this is sophistry: *ebhíḥ* has its own job to do, and a putative **asya* would be metrically identical to *ebhíḥ* in this position. As sometimes elsewhere, we must reckon with a gapped or non-overt correlative (as the publ. tr. seems to recognize). As for the sense of the instr. phrase I am not persuaded by "because of" and would prefer "(accompanied) by" or the like—"(accompanied) by (his) praise songs, you should be here for us." In other words, the actions and words of the unidentified ritualist have positive effects for the rest of us.

In 9c *ebhíḥ* may in fact be an overt correlative of *yé* in ab, as the publ. tr., Re, and WG interpr.: "those who ... with them ...," since the *staváthaiḥ* of 8c is absent and since the rel. cl. in 9ab has a plural subject (vs. 8a). However, by contrast both Ge and JSK assume a gapped **staváthaiḥ* with *ebhíḥ*, as in the last vs., and supply "(of theirs)": "with these (praise songs) (of theirs)." Again Ge (n. 8c) explains this as attraction. I am inclined to follow JPB, Re, and WG and take *ebhíḥ* as a real correlative, with this as a "repair" of the flawed syntax of 8c. But I'd slightly change the publ. tr. to "you should be favorable to us here along with them." In other words, even the past actions of previous ritualists continue to affect our current situation.

I provide a rough-and-ready tr. of both vss. after the treatments of the individual vss. below.

VII.1.8: Translating the voc. phrase first, as the publ. tr. does, makes the responsion of the two vss. less pronounced – but it does get the vocc. out of the traffic. Nonetheless I prefer to follow the order of the Skt. All four vocc. are accented because there is no non-voc. in the pāda to lean on. The first voc., *vásiṣṭha*, is, as pointed out by many, a pun on the eponymous poet of the maṇḍala. The voc. *dīdivaḥ* echoes *dīdihi* (3a) as well as, more distantly, *dīdhitibhiḥ* (1a). As in 3a, the long redupl. of this form is metrically problematic, producing a late break of H L.

The verb *idhaté* must be subjunctive (as the publ. tr. indeed represents it), but it is anomalous on several counts. The form, and this pair of vss., are discussed at length by Narten (Sig.Aor. 90–91). It is usually assigned to a root aor., but Narten vigorously disputes this, partly on the grounds of its formal anomalies: it has a zero-grade root and accent on the ending, while root aor. subjunctives have root accent and full-grade roots (*kárat(i)*, etc.). Its final vowel *-é* also scans long in hiatus, a scansion it shares with *bhejiré* in the flg. vs. Narten explains the form as a haplologized version of the nasal-infix pres. subj. in the phrase *agna *inádhate*. When the accented syllable *-ná-* was haplologized, the verb, needing an accent since it is in a relative clause, simply borrowed the ending accent of *bhejiré*. This is all very clever, but it seems excessively artificial. I explain the form quite differently. The zero-grade of the subjunctive here is a differentiating tactic: full-grade *edh* has been lexically specialized as a synchronically separate root √*edh* 'thrive' (< 'be flashy, flare up') with med. them. pres. *édhate* (see EWA s.v. *EDH*, Gotō [1st Kl. 108], flg. Th). A properly formed subjunctive to √*idh*, **édhate* 'will kindle', would be blocked by the existence of this present, so the subjunctive stuck with the *idh* that is hypercharacteristic of the root. (There are no full-grade verbal forms to the 'kindle' root

and only a few nominal forms in the RV: *édha-* 'kindling wood' [2x], *sameddhár-* 'kindler' [2x, admittedly once in this hymn, vs. 15].) Lacking a full-grade root syllable, *idhaté* simply followed the final accent found in the well-attested athem. part. *idhāná-*. There is no need to invoke *bhejiré* to explain the accent. I have no explanation for the heavy final syllable in hiatus for either of these forms – but then, neither does Narten.

Although Ge (n. 8c) and WG supply *sumánāḥ* in c, borrowed from 9c, the point of these two paired vss. seems to me to be that they are very similar, but not identical, and the differences should be noted and savored. The fuller *sumánāḥ ... syāḥ* in 9c can again be seen as a repair to the more minimal 8c.

VII.1.9: Once again I would delete the "our" with the "men" phrase – esp. here because the clause describes the parcelling out of Agni to the many different hearths of many different worshipers, not ours alone. As Ge (n. 8–9) characterizes it – those who were responsible for the spread of the Agni-cult.

Contra the publ. tr. "who shared among themselves ... many times," I take *ví √bhaj* as meaning 'distributed, apportioned' with (with most other tr.) *purutrā́* as 'in many places'. This describes the dividing and distributing of the unitary Agni into the many household fires shared by the Ārya community. It is a more explicit expression of the same idea that I see in vs. 2 (see comm. there). I would change the tr. of ab to "The ancestral mortal men, who distributed your face in many places ..."

VII.1.8–9 (retransl.):

8. He who will kindle your face here—o best Agni, flaming, shining, pure—
both (in those circumstances), (accompanied) by (his) praise songs you should be here for us —
9. The ancestral mortal men who distributed your face in many places, o Agni –
and (in those circumstances) you should be favorable to us here along with them.

The English is admittedly awkward, but tries to capture the larger structure of the *utó ... utó* construction, along with the slightly slant parallelism of the rest.

VII.1.10: The near-deictic *imé* with *náraḥ* contrasts strongly with *náraḥ pítryāsaḥ* "ancestral men" in the previous vs. (9b) and should be rendered "these men here." Though the *náraḥ* seem to be engaging in more martial pursuits than their ritual practice elsewhere in the hymn, their tie to the ritual is asserted in c – and their combat against obstracles and ungodly wiles can certainly be waged ritually.

The third pāda-final occurrence of *praśastá-* (in addition to 1b, 5b).

VII.1.11: It is worthy of note, given the contrast between *nṛ́-* and *vīrá-* in this hymn, as disc. above with regard to the publ. intro., that we have the independent gen. *nṛṇā́m* in contrast to the compounded *avīratā-*, even though both expressions refer to the lack of them.

I take *ní ṣadāma* here as a wordplay of sorts. The lexeme *ní √sad*, esp. in later Skt., can have the negative emotive sense 'be afflicted' < 'sink down' vel sim. But in the RV it also very frequently refers to ritual installation, esp. of Agni. Here I think both are in play.

On the one hand, given the prominent ritual role that *náraḥ* play in this hymn (see comm. above passim), we do not want to take up our ritual roles "in want of *nṛ́*-s" because under those circumstances we would be short of officiants and could not fulfill our ritual obligations; on that basis we also do not want to sink down in depression brought on by "want of *nṛ́*-s." I would (awkwardly) convey this in English with "let us not sit down [=be ritually installed] / sink down (in depression) in want of men."

In contrast, the lack of *vīrá-* that occupies the rest of the vs. has to do with lack of offspring. The standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) are surely right in supplying a form of √*sad* also with *pári* in b. The lexeme *pári* √*sad* is very prominent in nearby VII.4.6–7, where children or the lack thereof is also the concern. I'm not sure if there is any idiomatic meaning for the lexeme here, beyond the additive 'sit around' (like a campfire), though in VII.4.6–7 (q.v.) there seems in part to be. Given the focus on the domestic in bc of this vs., it may be that "sit around a fire" refers to the household fire around which the members of the household would gather and where a paucity of children would be glaringly obvious.

There are two ways to interpr. pāda c, each of which requires an interpretive add-on. Acdg. to the publ. tr. the lucky offspring-filled houses belong to others, while we sit around childless. By contrast, Ge and Re take c as the positive contrast to b: "let us not sit around you childless, (*but*) in houses full of offspring." Since both make sense and each requires something extra, I consider them both possible – with Ge/Re's interpr. a plausible alt. to the publ. tr.

VII.1.12: This vs. is immediately problematic because it appears to consist only of a rel. cl. Moreover, it has an overabundance of acc. sg. masc. forms, which are not all coreferential, and it is unclear which (if any) of them is the referent of the initial rel. prn. *yám*: *yajñám* (a)? *kṣáyam* (b)? Most tr. supply a main verb – usually 2nd sg. impv. "give" governing *kṣáyam* in b (Ge, Re, WG), but the publ. tr. a 3rd ps. impv. "(Let Agni approach)" that is otherwise identical to the indic. *upayā́ti* of the rel. cl. I would first say that I am not at all convinced by the publ. tr.: the supplied doublet main verb would be clumsy, and I am certain that Agni is not the *aśvī́* ("horseman" in the publ. tr.); see below. The tr. that supply "(give)" are more thinkable, but I still find the addition unnecessary.

There are several clues within the hymn itself and in passages adduced by Old and Ge that aid the interpr. First, *yám ... upayā́ti* is quite reminiscent of *tvā́m* [=Agni] ... *úpa yanti* in 3c and *úpa yám* [=Agni] *éti* in 6a, suggesting that Agni is the referent of the rel. here. Although Agni does not occur overtly in this vs., the voc. at the end of the previous vs., *durya*, 'you belonging to the house', does refer to Agni (see also *agne* in 11a), and so I suggest a slightly unorthodox structure in which the rel. clause beginning vs. 12 is dependent on a voc. in the previous vs. (Alternatively it could depend on the voc.-cum-impv. in 13a *pāhí no agne*.) This means that neither *yajñám* not *kṣáyam* belongs directly with the *yám* and they must be construed otherwise.

For the former, Ge (n. 12a) cites as a syntactic and lexical parallel II.2.11 *yám agne yajñám upayánti vājíno, nítye toké dīdivā́ṃsaṃ své damé* "(you) whom [=Agni] those with prizes approach for sacrifice, o Agni, as you shine amid (our) own offspring in (your) own house." This passage contains both a rel. prn. clearly referring to Agni and the loosely construed *yajñám* as a 2nd goal: "they approach Agni for/to sacrifice." The domestic and offspring-full context also happens to resemble our vs.

As for the *kṣáyam* phrase in bc, I take it as parallel to *yajñám* as another 2nd goal: the *aśvī́* approaches Agni (also) for a dwelling full of all such good things.

A few loose ends before putting the whole vs. together – first, who/what is the *aśvī́*? Of course, a singular *aśvín-* is distinctly odd, given the overwhelming no. of dual forms of this stem referring to the gods so named. However, there are 17 sg. forms (plus reps.). Though a few (e.g., II.27.16) seem to refer to a horseman (per JPB's tr. here), most mean 'having/providing horses' and modify headnouns like *rayí-* 'wealth'. See comm. ad IV.2.5. Flg. Old, I suggest that this is its meaning here, and it modifies a human – most likely a patron. See the passage adduced by Old, IV.4.10 *yás tvā s^{u}váśvaḥ suhiraṇyó agna, upayā́ti* ... "Whoever, rich in horses and gold, drives up to you, Agni ...," which is very similar to our own, but with *s^{u}váśvaḥ* for *aśvī́*. Note also that in the parallel II.2.11 discussed above, the subj. is *vājínaḥ*, rendered in the publ. tr. as "prize-winners" but which I would now change to "having prizes" (to give, presumably). These *vājínaḥ* were likely identified as *sūráyaḥ* in the preceding pāda (II.2.11b), and I now think that our *aśvī́* is likewise a patron with horses to distribute.

Finally *nítyam*. This recurs from 2c, where it definitely qualifies Agni – another support for interpr. *yám* here as Agni (though see 17b and 21c). Either sense (or both senses) of the word would fit here: the patron approaches his own fire and/or approaches the long-standing, stable fire in his house.

Putting all this together, I would tr. the whole vs. as

"(You [=Agni],) whom the one providing horses [=patron] approaches as his own / his constant (fire) for sacrifice and (approaches) for a dwelling filled with offspring and good descendents for us,

(a dwelling) having increased through the posterity belonging to our own kin-group."

The uninsistent phrase *svájanmanā śéṣasā* "by the posterity belonging to our own kin-group" is developed further in VII.4.7–8, where non-blood-kin are defined outside the family and not counted as posterity. See comm. there.

VII.1.14–15: These vss. begin identically, *séd agníḥ*, "this very Agni / just this Agni / it's just this Agni" – distinguishing our Agni from the competing other fires.

VII.1.14: This vs. is a more complex version of vs. 4, where the superiority of our fire is asserted over the other ones, and the place where our fire is (*yátrā* in both vss.) is also a gathering place -- in vs. 4 simply of well-born men (*náraḥ ... sujātā́ḥ*). Here the entities gathered are various and riddling.

I would add the definite article: "superior to the other fires," on the basis of my discussion of definite and indefinite *anyá-* (Fs. Beekes, 1997: "Vedic anyá- 'another, the other': Syntactic Disambiguation").

The items that come together in bc are, in the publ. tr., almost comically ill-assorted – "a prizewinning horse, a strong-handed lineage, / and the syllable [/the inexhaustible cow] with a thousand cattle-shelters" – and no help is provided to interpr. the list. The tr. is based on HPS (IIJ 15 [1973]: 31): "a racing horse, a stronghanded (son) propagating the family, the speech (or, cow) of a thousand folds," which is slightly but not appreciably easier to fathom. The other standard tr. generally take pāda b as having only

one entity, not two, with *vājī́* modifying *tánayaḥ* (e.g., Ge "ein sieghafter leiblicher Sohn mit starker Hand").

In contrast to all, I think the collection of elements is a response to the difficult vs. 12, discussed at length above. With HPS and JPB I think there are two entities in b, but I do not think one of them is a horse. Instead I take *vājī́* in its literal sense, 'having prizes (to confer)' – like *aśvī́* in 12a – and it refers to the patron. Recall that I suggest the same interpr. for pl. *vājínaḥ* in II.2.11, a passage very similar to our vs. 12 and discussed both immed. above and ad loc. The rest of the pāda, *tánayo vīḷúpāṇiḥ*, must refer to the offspring, lineage, posterity that occupied the attention of most of 12bc. I would tr. "a descendent with a firm hand," meaning one that can manage and maintain the family lineage successfully; "firm hand" may have the same extended sense as it does in English. There is a slight embarrassment with the adj., though: *vīḷúpāṇi-* in its other occurrence (VII.73.4) and the differently accented but semantically identical *vīḷupāṇí-* (1x: I.38.11) both modify horses and mean 'having hard hooves'. This might suggest that *vājī́* does refer to a prize-winning horse (per HPS and JPB), but I consider this a (playful?) red herring. Certainly neither HPS nor JPB tried to attach the adjective to their horse.

With the patron and the offspring found in pāda b, pāda c gives us the sacrifice (*yajñá-*) that was the third major element in vs. 12, in the form of the *akṣárā*, the imperishable syllable of sacrificial speech. The epithet *sahásrapāthā(ḥ)* 'having a thousand folds/pens' is puzzling, but a simpler phrase in this Agni cycle, VII.15.9 *akṣárā sahasríṇī*, provides some illumination. In my view (not shared by most), that phrase means "the syllable that has a thousand (parts) (i.e., syllables / words)." Both here and there I take *akṣárā* as referring to the unity of speech, which, however, is well known to be multiply subdivided – a concept widely discussed; see, for example, my Hyenas 255–57, as well as, e.g., I.164.41 *sahásrākṣarā paramé vyòman* "having a thousand syllables in highest heaven," said of Speech. In our passage the more complex modifier *sahásrapāthā(ḥ)* is mediated through the identification of the *akṣárā* as not only a syllable but the imperishable cow, who then can be seen as having a thousand cowpens (separate stalls containing the various subparts of speech). See Re's comm. ad loc.

The verb in c, *sámeti*, which serves for all three subjects, is singular because a series of singular subjects can optionally take a singular verb.

I would retranslate the vs. as follows:

"Just this Agni – let him be superior to the other fires, here where there gather one having prizes (to confer) [=patron], a descendent with a firm hand [=offspring],

(and) the syllable [=ritual speech] with a thousand cowpens [=divisions of speech]."

VII.1.15: The publ. tr.'s rendering of ab is syntactically incorrect, in that it tr. b as if it were the main cl. flg. an embedded rel. cl. (*yáḥ ... nipā́ti*). But the verb of b, *uruṣyā́t*, is accented and must continue the rel. cl. of a. The main cl. is then simply the opening annunciatory nominal *séd agníḥ*.

The publ. tr. also renders *vanuṣyatáḥ* as pl. ("the rapacious ones," presumably acc. pl.), but with this verbal lexeme (*ní √pā*) the enemy is in the abl. – hence *vanuṣyatáḥ* must be sg. here. (Note also 13ab *pāhí no agne rakṣáso ájuṣṭāt* ..., with clear abl. sg.) This pāda is almost identical to VI.15.12 and sim. to VII.56.19, as Ge (n. 15a) points out.

There is no overt acc. obj. with *nipā́ti*. It is perfectly easy to supply 'us', as in 13a just quoted, but I wonder if *sameddhā́ram* in b, obj. of *uruṣyā́t*, could serve; it immediately follows *nipā́ti*, though after the pāda break, and is thus strategically positioned between the two verbs. That, in its only other occurrence, *sameddhár-* is the object of a form of √*pā* construed with an abl. *áṃhasaḥ* -- in other words, a mash-up of our ab – might support this suggestion: VI.48.8 ... *pā́hy áṃhasaḥ*, *sameddhā́ram* ... "protect your kindler from narrow straits."

Putting this all together, I would retr. ab as

"Just this is the Agni who protects (us / his kindler) from the rapacious one (and) should deliver his kindler from constriction."

As noted above (ad 8a), *(sam)eddhár-* is one of the only forms to √*idh* with full grade *edh*.

Pāda c contains the only independent pl. form of *vīrá-* in this hymn (as opposed to five of *nṛ́-*), and the pāda (*sujātā́saḥ pári caranti vīrā́ḥ*) is similar to 4c *yátrā náraḥ samā́sate sujātā́ḥ*, with *vīrā́ḥ* for *náraḥ*. It is probably especially this pāda that led JPB to assert that the two groups "do not appear to be different people" (see disc. in intro. above). However, I argued against his view there, based on the other occurrences of the two stems in this hymn, suggesting that the *náraḥ* in this hymn are ritualists, while the *vīrá-* are hoped-for sons and heroes. I think it possible that these two similar pādas are meant to be contrastive. The *vīrā́ḥ* are described as "well born" here because it is their birth we have been eager for (see esp. 11bc); the lexeme *pári* √*car* is not specialized for ritual activity and seems similar to *pári* (√*sad*) in 11b, which I suggested referred to "sitting around" the household fire. The earlier parts of the vs. describe Agni's aggressive actions on behalf of his clients, and "heroes" would fit this context. I would tr. the pāda as "well-born heroes encircle (him)," with the sense that Agni is not alone in the aggressive actions taken earlier in the vs. Cf. Re's "les hommes-d'élite, bien nés, (lui) font entourage."

VII.1.16: The opening *ayáṃ só agníḥ* is a more emphatic expansion of the *séd agníḥ* that opened the last two vss. (14–15). The annunciatory near-deictic *ayám* "here is" seems implicitly to contrast with *ā́hutaḥ purutrā́* "bepoured in many places": the first seems to point to our ritual fire right here, while the *purutrā́* echoes the same word in 9b, where it referred to the parcelling out of many ritual fires in many places. In fact, I think that while *ayáṃ só agníḥ* picks out the ritual fire right in front of our eyes, the rest of the vs. (starting with *ā́hutaḥ*) describes the generic ritual procedures that the fire undergoes everywhere. In the next vs. (17) we will claim those generic actions for our own and perform them on our specific ritual fire. To signal my interpr. I would substitute "a" for "the" with the titles of the ritual personnel.

Re suggests that the *ī́śānaḥ* is the Yajamāna; this may well be, though adjusted for the fact that the Yajamāna as a separate role, as in later śrauta ritual, does not seem to have been entirely differentiated from the other ritual participants in the RV.

At least by my interpr., *pári ... éti* refers to an entirely different type of action – a ritual circumambulation vel sim. – from *pári caranti* in the preceding vs. (15c). The ritual setting is of course established by *adhvaréṣu hótā*.

I would alter the tr. slightly but apurpose:

"Right here is this Agni (of ours), bepoured (with ghee) in many places, whom a master kindles, bringing an oblation,

whom a Hotar goes around at the rites."

VII.1.17: As just noted, the first two pādas repeat the generic actions of 16ab but assign them to "us," the ritualists right here. The lexicon matches point for point: *ī́śānaḥ* (16b): *ī́śānāsaḥ* (17b), *ā́hutaḥ* (16a): *ā́ juhuyāma* (17b), *havíṣmān* (16b): *āhávanāni* (17a).

As for *nítyā*, I do not think (with the publ. tr.) that it refers to "the oblations that are your [=Agni's] own." Rather, as usual in this hymn (vss. 2, 12, 21) it can have both of its standard senses: 'constant, stable, regular' and 'own', but in the latter case belonging to the subject, not to Agni. In the former sense it would identify the oblations as the ones regularly made into the fire (see Ge "die ... ständigen Opferspenden"; nearly identical WG). On the other hand, given the contrast between the generic fire in 16 and our own particular fire in this vs., it can refer to *our own* oblations (cf. Re "les ... offrandes-liquides propres (à nous-mêmes").

The puzzling part of the vs. is the dual *vahatū́* in c. The other ten RVic occurrences of the stem *vahatú-* are clearly specialized as the wedding procession / wedding journey; see comm. ad X.32.3, 85.13. The publ. tr. "as we make the twin bridal processions" thus properly reflects the usage of the stem elsewhere. The explanation in the publ. intro. follows Ge (n. 17c): "the circumambulation of the Hotar with the fire around the fire-place is described as the procession of a bride and groom around the fire at a wedding. The imagery of the wedding establishes that Agni is now a member of the family of the householder" (fld. also by Re and WG; see Old for detailed disc.). This may well be, and in fact would rephrase more elaborately the generic pāda c of the paired vs. 16: *pári yám éty adhvaréṣu hotā́* "whom the Hotar goes around at the rites." Two issues disquiet me, however: the emphasis on the doubleness, with the dual reinforced by *ubhā́*: *ubhā́ ... vahatū́* "both wedding journeys." The participation of both fire and Hotar suggested by Ge and accepted by JPB doesn't seem sufficient to justify this emphasis. Moreover, the *vahatú-* should go in a straight line, from the bride's family to the groom's; it is not a circumambulation. I therefore propose an alternative, partly suggested by the use of *vahatú-* in X.32 (vss. 3–4). As discussed there in the publ. intro and in the comm. ad vss. 3, 4, and 5, the word *vahatú-* is used metaphorically there to indicate the journey of the gods to the sacrifice and, implicitly, the counter-journey of the oblations to the gods – the usual apparently conflicting models of Vedic sacrifice that coexist throughout the RV. Here I think "both bridal processions" refer to this two-way traffic as it were. The next vs. (18) clearly portrays the "oblations to the gods" model in its 2nd two pādas and gestures towards the "gods to oblations" model in pāda a. The presence of *miyédhe* 'at the ceremonial meal' in our vs. may have evoked the wedding imagery.

I would retr. the vs. as

"In you, o Agni, might we as masters pour the many regular oblations (/ our own oblations),

creating both "bridal processions" [= gods to sacrifice, oblations to gods] at the ceremonial meal."

VII.1.18: This vs. contains two contrastive forms of √*vī* (a: *vītátamāni*, c: *práti ... vyantu*), which in my view express the two different ritual models just discussed. With Re and the publ. tr. (but contra Ge / WG), I take pāda a as a nominal sentence, and further, with Re, I take the opening *imó* [= *imā́* + *u*] as annunciatory: "here are the most pursued (oblations)"

(Re "Voici ..."). As disc. at length elsewhere (see esp. my 2024 "Vedic Evidence for the Verbal-Governing *dā́ti-vāra-* Compound 'Type' " [IEL 12: 9–11]), the root √*vī* means 'pursue'; when gods are the subject, the object is oblations (vel sim.). Here the ppl. modifies the oblations, so the assumption is that their pursuers are the gods – and the gods are coming to the ritual in this pursuit. This is the "gods to sacrifice" model, emphasized by the near-deictic *imā́*: "Right here are the most pursued (oblations)." But the oblations-to-gods model appears unambiguously in the next pāda, where Agni is urged to take the oblations to the gods.

In c the idiom *práti* √*vī* means 'accept'; see comm. ad VIII.39.5. Here the gods (at least acdg. to Re and JPB; other tr. leave the subjects unspecified) are urged to accept the oblations – presumably in heaven, where Agni brought them. I would retr. the vs.

"Here are the most pursued (oblations), o Agni; unwearying, convey them to the divine assembly.

Let them [=the gods] accept our sweet-scented (oblations)."

VII.1.19: With this vs. the hymn turns to Triṣṭubh, with the most recent ritually focused five-vs. sequence (14–18) finished. But there is no appreciable change in tone from the earlier parts of the hymn; indeed vs. 19 is reminiscent of the various previous vss. calling on Agni's help against various disasters (7, 11, 13, 15), sometimes with the same lexical items.

In fact, the stem *avîratā-* recurs from 11b (instr. *avîratā*). In our vs. it is clearly a dative, but the form is anomalous: we should expect *avîratāyai*, which is in fact attested in III.16.5 in a context very like ours: *mā́ no agne ámataye*, *mā́vīratāyai rīradhaḥ*. Lanman (Noun infl. 359) suggests that, in his putative rewriting of this pāda, **mā́vīratāyai no agne párā dāḥ*, sandhi would have obscured the alpha privative and so this other form was cooked up (though this is not a problem in III.16.5) -- an explanation endorsed by AiG III.117. But this solution seems both artificial and over-elaborate. Better to consider the *-e* ending an anticipation of the dative *-e* forms parallel to it in this vs.: b *durvā́sase 'mataye* , c *kṣudhé ... rakṣáse* (out of sandhi). Or posit a stem **avīratāt-* next to *avîratā-*, like *devátāt-* beside *devátā-*. Its dat. **avîratāte* could then have suffered haplology to *avîrate*, again influenced by the other *-e* datives in the vs. A third, unlikely, possibility is that the poet was operating with a cons. stem **avîrat-*, to which the instr. *avīratā* (11) and dat. *avîrate* (here) would be expected – but such a stem (a *-t-*suffix to a thematic formation) would fall far outside the bounds of normal Vedic derivation.

I would, once more, substitute 'heroes' for 'men'.

durvā́sas- is a hapax, almost universally taken as a bahuvr. modifying *ámataye*, in a striking image: "neglect with its shabby dress" (publ. tr.). However, I think it's possible (no more than that) that it's a noun independent of *ámati-* and means something like 'ragged clothing'. Note that in X.33.2 *ámati-* is adjacent to *nagnátā* 'nakedness': *ní bādhate ámatir nagnátā jásuḥ* "Neglect, nakedness, and exhaustion oppress (me)." Nakedness and rags are conceptually akin. So a possible alt. for b is "to ragged clothing, to neglect ..."

On the meaning of *ámati-* see comm. ad X.42.10, a vs. where it also appears with *kṣúdh-* 'hunger'.

The publ. tr. rendering of *ā́ juhūrthāḥ* "do not be angry" reflects the Insler/Kü assignment of these redupl. forms to √*hṝ* 'be angry' (also fld. by WG) rather than √*hvṛ*

'go astray, deflect' (Gr etc.) -- an interpr. I reject (see comm. ad I.43.8). I accept the older interpr. fld. also by Ge and Re. Our form presents a morphophonological problem for this interpr., however, namely the heavy root syllable *hūr* / _ C. This is to be expected from the seṭ root √*hṝ*, but not the aniṭ root √*hvṛ*, and so is one argument in favor of the newer interpr. However, since the other redupl. forms belonging here, *juhuraḥ* (in nearby VII.4.4), *juhuranta* have short vowel -*ur*- before a vowel, I assume the pre-V / pre-C alternation originating in long-resonant -*ŭr*- and -*ŭr*- roots has simply favored the introduction of the long-vowel pre-C variant in this form. I would alter the tr. to "do not let us go astray at home or in the forest" – a more specific encoding of the *grāmya-* / *araṇya-* merism. The possibility of going astray at home or abroad (esp. in the forest *váne*) is a real concern, whereas it doesn't really matter what place Agni got angry in.

VII.1.20: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. ends with the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain, and the whole vs. is repeated as 25, the final vs. of the whole hymn. It thus seems to provide a first, false ending to the hymn, oddly not coinciding with the metrical transition.

VII.1.21: On the bahuvrīhi type of *raṇvá-saṃdṛś-* as a non-counterexample to the prohibition against root-noun cmpds with both a nominal 1st member and a preverb, see my 2024 "Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian" (Fs. Kellens), pp. 141–42 + n. 13.

The impv. *didīhi* almost, but not quite, reproduces *dīdihi* in 3a. Here, at least, the form fits the meter. The two variants should be rendered in the same way, an aim complicated by the etymological figure here, *sudītî ... didīti*. I have added 'brightly' to the tr. of *dīdihi* in 3 to partially take care of this problem.

On *sácā* with loc. see comm. ad IV.31.5, where I suggest it's a pleonastic marker of a loc. abs. I consider *tvé sácā* halfway between such an expression ("when you are there") and the richer semantics of the publ. tr.'s "in company with you."

This is the 4th occurrence of *nítya-* in this hymn (also vss. 2, 12, 17), and as in those vss. (q.v.), both senses of the stem can be in play here. The publ. tr. "our own lineage" is perhaps the more obvious, given that it modifies *tánaye*. But the sense 'regular, constant, stable' works well with *mā́ ... ā́ dhak* "let there be no falling short," the idea being that the kin-descent should be constant and continuing. I would emend to "when you are there, let there be no falling short in our own lineage (/our regular continuance)."

The final pāda is quite striking, because it unites in a single phrase the two human groups that have been contrasted throughout this hymn -- *vīrá-* and *nṛ́-* -- in the phrase *vīráḥ ... náryaḥ* 'manly hero'. I think this fusion is deliberate after the separation prevailing earlier in the hymn; we know that we need both *náraḥ* and *vīrā́ḥ*, and our fear of a dearth of each of them was expressed in adjacent pādas in 11ab. Here this fear has been given abbreviated and unified form. The phrase *vîra- nárya-* is also found in I.40.3, VI.23.4, 24.2, but these passages are not much help in interpr. this one (and in VI.24.2 the referent is Indra): the particular shape of this hymn, with the contrast of the two stems, builds to its own special climax here.

I would render *asmát* as the abl. it is: "from us," not "among us."

VII.1.22: The tone shifts in this vs. The possibility that Agni may look on us with disfavor and punish us, perhaps unfairly, now arises.

I believe that the publ. tr. has badly misunderstood the first hemistich. It interprets the loc. phrase *sácaiṣú devéddheṣv agníṣu* as causal: "since these fires are kindled by the gods," with this presented as the reason that we can't be accused of poorly maintaining these same fires (sim. Re). But as just noted with regard to 21a, *sácā* generally just marks a loc. absol. (see comm. ad IV.31.5). As Ge suggests (n. 22b), the "god-kindled fires" are most likely heavenly bodies, esp. the sun (but also the stars, I would suggest). Here they would be witnesses to Agni's accusation, as they are witnesses later in Maṇḍala VII to the innocence or guilt of men (e.g., VII.60.1, 62.2, also adduced by Ge). I take Agni's accusation not to be that we do not maintain those fires, but that we are bad or slack at bringing offerings to the ritual fire. For the first hemistich I would substitute "The god-kindled fires [=heavenly lights] being there (as witnesses), do not call us out for (our) poor offering, o Agni."

The interpr. of cd rests in large part on *bhṛmā́t* – what the word means and whose *bhṛmá-* is in question: ours, Agni's, or no one's in particular. The hemistich is disc. extensively by Old, and the various tr. render *bhṛmá-* differently, as 'haste', 'impatience', 'error', or 'confusion' (the last = publ. tr.). The stem is found only once elsewhere in the RV, at VIII.61.12, where it is likewise disputed. There I take it to mean 'blur', from √*bhram* 'whirl'. That sense won't work here, but 'confusion' seems the mental state closest to it. I wonder, however, if it is actually our confusion (per the publ. tr. and most others) – I think rather that the poet is (charitably but also self-protectively) ascribing Agni's bad thoughts towards us as the result of *Agni*'s confusion. The *cid* gives me slight pause, but I am inclined to read it as qualifying the following noun (as occasionally elsewhere) in the whole phrase *bhṛmā́c cid, devásya* "because of the confusion even of a god" – slightly unless , I admit, but it makes more sense. I would alter the tr. to "Let not your bad thoughts (arising) from the confusion even of a god [=you] reach us, o son of strength." The use of *bhṛmá-* for Agni's "confusion" is esp. apt, given the whirling, swirling nature of physical fire.

VII.1.24: I would substitute 'of great welfare' for 'of easy passage'.

VII.1 Agni (emended translation)

1. The men gave birth to Agni in the two fire-churning sticks, by their visionary powers and the motion of their hands—the one proclaimed,
the houselord, visible from far, seeking the way.
2. The good ones installed Agni in his home [=fireplace], him of lovely gaze, for his help wherever (his home might be),
(as the one) who is constantly [/has constantly been] to be besought for his skill in the (sacrificer's) house as (his/its) own (fire).
3. When you are kindled forth, Agni, shine brightly in front for us with your inexhaustible, beautifully undulating wave (of light), o youngest one.
One after another, prizes go towards you.
4. Your brilliant fires, abounding in good heroes, keep blazing forth, better than the (other) fires,

here where the well-born men sit together.
5. Through insight, Agni, give us wealth that abounds in good heroes and good descendants, o capable one, (wealth to be) proclaimed,
which the invading sorcerer does not overcome.
6. The very skillful one towards whom the young oblation-bearing girl [=the ladle], filled with ghee, goes in the evening and at dawn,
towards him (goes) our own devotion, seeking goods.
7. Agni, burn away all hostile powers with the heat by which you burned Jarūtha.
Banish sickness without a sound.
8. He who will kindle your face here—o best Agni, flaming, shining, pure—
both (in those circumstances), (accompanied) by (his) praise songs you should be here for us —
9. The ancestral mortal men who distributed your face in many places, o Agni –
and (in those circumstances) you should be favorable to us here along with them.
10. Let these men here, champions at the smashing of obstacles, prevail over all ungodly wiles—
they who marvel at my insight that is proclaimed.
11. Agni, let us not sit down [=be ritually installed] / sink down (in depression) in want of men, nor (let us sit) around you without posterity because of a lack of heroes [=sons],
(*but* let us sit) in houses full of offspring (/*and not*) amid (other) houses filled with offspring), o you belonging to the house –
12. (You [=Agni]) whom the one providing horses [=patron] approaches as his own / his constant (fire) for sacrifice and (approaches) for a dwelling filled with offspring and good descendants for us,
(a dwelling) having increased through the posterity belonging to our own kin-group.
13. Protect us, Agni, from the detestable demon. Protect us from the crookedness of the ungenerous and malicious one.
With you as my yokemate, I would prevail over those doing battle (with me).
14. Just this Agni – let him be superior to the other fires, here where there gather one having prizes (to confer) [=patron], a descendent with a firm hand [=offspring],
(and) the syllable [=ritual speech] with a thousand cowpens [=divisions of speech].
15. Just this is the Agni who protects (us / his kindler) from the rapacious one (and) should deliver his kindler from constriction.
Well-born heroes encircle (him).
16. Right here is this Agni (of ours), bepoured (with ghee) in many places, whom a master kindles, bringing an oblation,
whom a Hotar goes around at the rites.
17. In you, o Agni, might *we* as masters pour the many regular oblations (/ our own oblations),
creating both "bridal processions" [= gods to sacrifice, oblations to gods] at the ceremonial meal.
18. Here are the most pursued (oblations), o Agni; unwearying, convey them to the divine assembly.
Let them [=the gods] accept our sweet-scented (oblations).

19. Agni, do not hand us over to a lack of heroes. To neglect with its shabby dress (/ to ragged clothing, to neglect) —do not hand us over to this.

Do not (hand) us (over) to hunger nor to the demon, o you who possess the truth. Do not let us go astray at home or in the forest.

20. Now direct my formulations upwards, Agni. O god, you will sweeten them for our generous (patrons).

We on both sides [=priests and patrons] would be in your generosity. —Do you protect us always with your blessings.

21. O Agni, you are of easy summons and joy-bringing appearance. Shine brightly with your good brightness, o son of strength.

When you are there, let there be no falling short in our own lineage (/our regular descendance). Let the manly hero not fade away from us.

22. The god-kindled fires [=heavenly lights] being there (as witnesses), do not call us out for (our) poor offering, o Agni.

Let not your bad thoughts (arising) from the confusion even of a god [=you] reach us, o son of strength.

23. That mortal is rich, o Agni of beautiful face, who pours the oblation in the immortal one.

He [=Agni or the mortal] establishes him [=the mortal or Agni] as one who gains goods among the gods, the one to whom the inquiring patron goes, seeking his ends.

24. Since you know of great welfare, Agni, convey here to our patrons lofty wealth,

by which, o powerful one, we would rejoice as those undiminished in lifetime and having abundant good heroes.

25. Now direct my formulations upwards, Agni. O god, you will sweeten them for our generous (patrons).

We on both sides [=priests and patrons] would be in your generosity. —Do you protect us always with your blessings.

VII.2 Āprī [SJ on JPB]

Re treats the Āprī hymns in EVP XIV, with this one pp. 46ff.

VII.2.2: In order to bring out the somewhat unusual syntax of the rel./correl. construction, I'd move "who" to the front of the 2nd hemistich, which is where it is in the Skt.: "... among these / who – the bright gods ... – sweeten both oblations."

VII.2.3: The publ. tr. plucks *vaḥ* from Wackernagel's position in pāda a and construes it with d: "him would we ... ever exalt for you." Although this is not impossible, it seems better to find a more local application for *vaḥ*. I would favor Ge's "von euch zu berufen ist," construing it as the agent with *īḷényaṃ* -- dative agents being common with gerundives. Alternatively Re as dat. of benefit with *īḷényam*, and WG take it with *ásuram* ("Euren Herrn").

The WG tr. of pāda b is peculiar, among other things seeming to take *satyavā̃cam* as a bahuvrīhi, which it is not (note the accent).

VII.2.4: I would prefer the more accurate "twist" for "spread"; the latter should be a form of √*stṝ*, found elsewhere in the corresponding vs. in Āprī hymns (e.g., I.13.5 *stṛṇītá bárhiḥ*).

The 2nd hemistich is ambiguous as to referent. Although the default referent for the object should be the barhis because it is the signature word of the vs., in fact most of the phraseology is more commonly used of Agni. Both potential referents are freely available at the end of the preceding pāda: b ... *barhír agnaú* #. The adj. *ghṛtápṛṣṭha-* 'ghee-backed' standardly modifies Agni; transitive forms of the verbal root √*mṛj* regularly have him as obj. (see, e.g., in the next hymn VII.3.5 *agním ... marjayanta*). The part. *ājúhvānāḥ* 'pouring, libating' is generally used of oblations poured into the fire. Indeed, putting all these together — if the barhis is the referent, we have a picture of a gloppy greasy mess of grass, on which no self-respecting god would want to sit – or so we might think. With Agni as referent, it all makes better sense. However, two factors weigh against these considerations: 1) the other adj. *pṛ́ṣadvat* 'dappled' is neut. (like *barhís-*), not masc. (like *agní-*), and 2) however uninviting we might find it, the barhis is anointed with ghee elsewhere: see our same adj. *ghṛtápṛṣṭham* clearly modifying *barhíḥ* in I.13.5 and the phrase *ghṛténāktám* "anointed with ghee" of *barhíḥ* in II.3.5 (both adduced by Ge [n. 4c], both in Āprī hymns). The publ. tr. is therefore correct; however, I think the alt. interpr., with Agni as obj., is at least being flirted with. In fact, Re supplies Agni as obj. here, though he does not say how he squares this interpr. with the neut. *pṛ́ṣadvat*. (It could be taken as a neut. adv. "in a dappled fashion," but Re does not so tr.)

VII.2.5: The key phrase in this vs. in most Āprī hymns is *dvā́ro devī́ḥ* "divine doors" (nom., e.g., I.13.6, II.3.6), to which the corresponding acc. should be *dúro *devī́ḥ*. Although we don't get the qualifier here, the *deváyantaḥ* immed. flg. *dúraḥ* echoes the standard phrase.

For *deváyantaḥ* I would replace "serving the gods" with "seeking the gods," esp. to avoid the appearance that the participle is related to the phrase "ritually serving" opening the preceding vs. and tr. *saparyávaḥ*.

The publ. tr. of the VP in ab is somewhat awk., in that the lexeme *ví ... áśiśrayuḥ* "have laid open" has undergone what we might call extreme English tmesis, to "... have **laid** *the doors* that seek the (divine) chariot **open** ...," which is esp. problematic because what's happening in the middle isn't clear (see below). I would substitute "have laid open the doors ..."

The real problem is *rathayúḥ*, which should be a masc. nom. sg., in a context lacking any such referent. Here the referential choices are masc. nom. pl. (the priestly subjects) or fem. acc. pl. (the doors). However, X.70.5, which presents us with the same problem, decides firmly for the latter, since there, also an Āprī hymn in a "doors" vs., the doors are nom. pl. and must – morphology be damned! – be modified by *rathayúḥ*. See comm. ad loc. (However, in our passage Ge takes *rathayúḥ* as modifying the masc. pl. subj., though as modifying the doors in X.70.5.) WG take *rathayúr devátātā* as an independent nom. cl.: "Der Streitwagenfahrer ist (jetzt) in der Götterwelt." This is appealing (though I don't know what it would refer to), but it's not a solution available in X.70.5, where *rathayúḥ* is in the middle of a clause with fem. pl. subj. and 2nd pl. impv. Whatever we do with one of these passages has to work for the other. Nonetheless, I don't know why the doors would be "seeking a/the chariot"; the only other occurrence of the

stem modifies Indra in I.51.14 in a string of such formations expressing other things Indra wants (horses, cows, goods).

As for *devátātā*, it is most likely (with Gr etc.) loc. sg. to *devátāti-* rather than instr. sg. to *devátāt-*. These stems generally mean 'divine assemblage', but sometimes (see comm. ad III.26.2) 'attendance on the gods', which I think is the meaning here. I don't know of good evidence for the publ. tr.'s "the gods' realm." The point here, presumably, is that the opening of the doors is a preliminary action in the ritual attendance on the gods, allowing the gods access to the ritual ground.

As disc. in the publ. intro., the 2nd hemistich combines two incompatible images of the doors, as mother cows and as unmarried girls, both mediated through the grammatical gender of the doors, which is fem. The publ. tr. puts d before c, with the latter embedded in the former. Although this is strictly possible, the result is a bit like a stream-of-consciousness "house that Jack built" – so I will separate the two pādas, with c preceding d.

Pāda c is constructed around the part. *rihāṇé* 'licking'. The pāda is couched in the dual because (despite the plural in pāda a) doors come in pairs, with the outside of each fixed and the inside swinging for their unfixed edges to meet in the middle. *pūrvī́* in the dual must refer to many pairs of such doors (as is recog. by the publ. tr. inter alia). Although JPB supplies "the chariot" (extracted from *rathayú-* in b) as obj. of licking in the frame (i.e., the double doors are licking the chariot), with Ge et al. I take the participle in the frame as reciprocal (/reflexive) "licking each other" (/"licking themselves"), an image of the two inner edges of the doors swishing against each other as they close and open. (Since they are being anointed, the ghee dripping down the edges would count as saliva.) In the simile the part. does have an expressed obj. *śíśum* and has a self-involved sense – they are licking their own young. The difference between the syntax of the frame and of the simile is yet another ex. of the artful disharmony between simile and frame that poets exploit, as I discussed long ago.

Since there is no distinction between nom. and acc. in duals, pāda c presents itself as a nominal clause, but when we reach d, it becomes clear that frame+simile of c is embedded, as an acc., as the frame in another frame+simile in d – with the doors compared to unmarried girls (note here the distinction in number between the dual doors and the pl. girls). The anointing of girls going to assemblies is for adornment, a kind of make-up – see I.124.8 adduced in the publ. intro.

Putting this all together, I would retr. the whole vs. as

"Very attentive, those seeking the gods have laid open the (divine) doors, which seek the chariot, in attendance on the gods.

The many (double doors) licking each other like mother (cows) a calf – (those doors) do they [=priests] anoint like unmarried girls at (marriage) assemblies."

VII.2.6: We now move to another female pair, Dawn and Night.

In this vs. the *naḥ* of pāda a (which is not in Wackernagel's position) most comfortably construes with *suvitā́ya* in d, as in the publ. tr. This might lend support to the similar leapfrogging of *vaḥ* from a to d in vs. 3 (see above), though I still prefer to read that one locally.

VII.2.7: Once again, the poet thwarts our expectations about the key word of the vs. In vs. 5 this only involved leaving out the epithet of the topic: "doors," rather than "divine doors." Here the standard phrase *daívyā hótārā* found in this vs. in Āprī hymns is entirely absent, though there is an insistent dual phrase referring to other ritual personnel. (On these expressions see publ. tr.) And the task of the Divine Hotars, to perform the sacrifice, is expressed by the infinitival dative *yájadhyai* and its expansion in pāda c. Though Ge (fld. by WG) take the Divine Hotars as object of that infinitive and "I" as the subject (Ge: "euch gedenke ich zu verehren"), the standard phraseology of Āprī hymns make the two Hotars the sacrificers. See comm. ad X.110.7.

VII.2.8–11: These vss. are identical to III.4.8–11. See publ. tr. of those vss., with comm.

VII.3 Agni [SJ on JPB]

VII.3.1: The final word of pāda a, *sajóṣā(ḥ)*, is much discussed. The first question is what stem does it belong to – *sajóṣa-* or *sajóṣas-*? If the former, its form is unproblematic – it's a nom. pl. masc. (so Gr, Lub, WG) – but its application does raise problems: it should not be the priestly subjects who are associated with "the (other) fires," but Agni himself. But Agni appears in this vs. as an acc., and it is not morphologically posssible to make *sajóṣāḥ* an acc. sg. masc. Old identifies it as an adverbial neut. in *-ās*, but one would prefer not to posit *-ās* neuters to *-as*-stems as a general role (though it does sometimes seem nec.; see comm. ad II.31.5 and passim). I prefer a version of Re's apparent (but rather vaguely expressed) solution: that the nom. sg. masc. form to *sajóṣas-* and the nom. pl. masc. form to *sajóṣa-*, which are identical *sajóṣās*, are so common, in correct syntactic usage, that *sajóṣās* has become interpr. as an honorary adv. See, in this group of hymns alone, VII.5.9 (with sg. Agni as subj.) VII.10.4 (where it should be construed with acc. sg. *índram*). This explan. must also account for the use of *sajóṣāḥ* with masc. du. in I.118.11 and with fem. du. in IV.56.4.

VII.3.2: I would take the injunc. *próthat* as presential (/habitual): "he snorts."

Willi (Origins of the Grk Verb, 400) takes the augmented aor. in b, *vy àsthāt*, as "completive": "when it has stepped out." Possibly, but the immediate past of the aorist works fine here too. In this case I think *ví √sthā* is being used in two different senses: in the simile it describes the action of the horse "breaking free" (publ. tr.) or "stepping out" (Willi) of the corral vel sim. But when used of fire, this lexeme generally depicts the spreading out of fire across territory, as in V.8.3 *abhí jráyāṃsi pā́rthivā ví tiṣṭhase* "you spread over the earthly expanses." This point was already made by Ge (n. 2b). To capture this split sense, I would substitute "when it [=horse] has stood free [/ he [=Agni] has spread out] from its/his great enclosure." (A "completive" sense works less well here, since it's unlikely that the fire has finished spreading.)

As usual, I would suggest "after that" for *ā́d*, rather than simply "then."

The shift from 3rd ps. ref. to Agni in c (*asya*) to 2nd in d (*te*) seems maladroit, perhaps because it's so uninsistent.

VII.3.3–4: Both vss. begin PREV *yásya te* — in 3 there is no correlative in the main cl; in 4c the pronoun *te* is repeated.

VII.3.4: The phrase *pṛthivyā̆m pā̆jo aśret* is found in III.14.1; see comm. ad loc and my emended tr. there.

On the sense of *sám √vṛj* see comm. ad X.61.17.

The phrase *séneva sṛṣṭā̆* is found also in I.66.7 and I.143.5; in both those passages I tr. *sénā* as 'army': "set loose like an army," "like an army unleashed." The rendering here, "like a loosed weapon," is perfectly possible, since *sénā-* has both senses in the RV. But I would suggest at least an alt. with 'army' (with all the other standard tr.), esp. since the *sénā* is compared to the progress of Agni's "leading edge" in pāda a and his "advance / onslaught" in c, motion more appropriate to an army than a weapon.

On the latent pun on pāda d, see publ. intro. The primary root affiliation of *vivekṣi* is with *√viṣ* 'work (over)', which has a well-established redupl. pres. *viveṣṭi* (etc.); see esp. Old's disc. This works well with the frame: the obj. supplied by most tr. (incl. publ. tr.) is "wood," matching the phrase *tṛṣú ... ánnā véviṣat* in X.91.7 "constantly worrying the dry food [=wood]." The same NP is the obj. in our pāda b. But *vivekṣi* could technically also belong to *√vic* 'sift', which would be appropriate to 'barley'. Granted that *√vic* does not attest a redupl. pres. elsewhere, but the phonological neutralization of the two root syllables before *-si* would enable the pun. I would suggest an alt. to capture the wordplay: "with your tongue you work over (the wood) as if (sifting) barley."

VII.3.5: I would slightly change the tr. of ab to bring out its rhetorical structure and the repeated *tám* in pāda a: "Just him at evening, him at dawn – youngest Agni – do the men groom like a steed."

I would also prefer "whetting" to "sharpening" in c.

VII.3.7: I would slightly rephrase ab to make the purpose clause of *yáthā* + OPT clearer: "So that we may do ritual service to Agni for you at the svāhā-call with ..."

I do not know what to do with *pári*, which opens b. The root *√dāś* does not otherwise occur with *pári*. Only Re seems concerned about this question – he suggests that it's adverbial or an unusual preverb with *√dāś*. I prefer the former: perhaps b should be tr. "with libations and ghee-drenched oblations all around."

VII.3.8: Although there is no overt referent either for the rel. fem. pl.s or their correl., the "strongholds" (fem. *púr-*) of 7d easily supply the referent. Although this is accepted by all standard tr., Ge (n. 8ab) instead suggests *tanvàḥ* 'bodies' as an alt., on the basis of III.20.2. This seems unlikely, esp. since the verb of the main cl. here, *ní pāhi*, is the same as the one in 7d, construed with *pūrbhíḥ*.

I would prefer "for the pious man" to "for your servant."

Re suggests that *gíraḥ ... nṛvátīḥ* are songs "procurant des hommes-forts," rather than simply being 'manly', citing also VII.26.2 *ukthám ... nṛvát*. But in the latter passage Re's suggested meaning fits poorly.

VII.3.10: Although *√dī* often simply means 'shine', it not infrequently takes an acc. like 'wealth' in the sense "shine wealth (to us / here, etc.)," as here. This might be best termed an Inhaltsakk., expressing the makeup of the light emitted.

Since I now accept Tichy's interpr. of the idiom *ápi √vat* as 'become / make familiar with' (see comm. ad I.128.2 and Tichy, Die Spr. 26 [1980]: 3–5, esp. n. 8 [= KlSch 108–10]), I would emend this tr. to "might we become familiar with resolve ..." Her tr. of this passage is "möchten wir mit wohlachtsamer Geisteskraft vertraut sein."

VII.4 Agni [SJ on JPB]

I do not subscribe to the view expressed in the publ. intro. that the parts of the hymn that seem to express a desire for sons of one's own blood are actually about the poet's desire for a fire of his own (a view partly coinciding with some unpersuasive ideas of Old about vss. 6–8). It just requires too much reframing, manipulation, and metaphorization of what seems to be fairly clear language. At best, I would say that Agni, as one's own ritual fire in one's own home (3c), provides a model for the desired son of one's own blood, who will be at home in the household.

VII.4.1: On the identification of *bhānú-* 'radiant beam' and Agni here, see comm. as V.16.1.

I would substitute "goes between" for "goes among" for *antár ... jígāti*. Although the phrase *janū́ṃṣi ... víśvāni* "all races" (per JPB; perhaps better here "creatures" or "kinds") is plural (hence, I assume, his "among"), the image is the standard one of Agni toggling between the two poles, earth with its humans and heaven with its gods, an image emphasized by the preverb *antár*. The plural simply refers to there being lots of each, or lots of kinds of each.

VII.4.2: On the idiom *yátaḥ √jan* ("as soon as born") see comm. ad III.10.6. I would emend pāda b to "as soon as he has been born from his mother, as the youngest one" – not only changing "since" to "as soon as" but also taking *mātúḥ* as abl., independent of *yáviṣṭhaḥ*, not as gen. dependent on it. I make the latter choice because *yáviṣṭha-* is a standard, stand-alone epithet of Agni; see, in this Agni cycle alone, VII.1.3, 3.5, 7.3, 10.5, 12.1, in addition to this vs.

Pāda c has only 10 syllables and a bad cadence; there is no obvious fix. Old comments with perhaps uncharacteristic insouciance "Typische Unterzähligkeit" and rejects suggested emendations. The final word of the pāda, *śúcidan*, is also pāda-final in its other occurrence (V.7.7), a dimeter pāda also lacking a syllable. These metrical flaws may be connected, but I'm not sure how. In any case, its two light syllables should disqualify it from any standard cadence.

I would substitute "with his blazing tooth" for "flaming," to match my interpr. of 3d.

The pāda is very similar to X.115.2 (cited by Ge n. 2c): *sáṃ yó vánā yuváte bhásmanā datā́* "who wrests together the (pieces of) wood with his gnawing tooth." I might suggest as alt. "wrests together" for "completely grips."

VII.4.3: It is hard to know what to do with the first pāda syntactically. It consists of a loc. phrase with dependent gen. *asyá devásya* obviously referring to Agni. Although on syntactic grounds alone it could form part of the rel. cl. in b, since it's only one constituent, this won't work because the referents of the just-cited gen. phrase and of the acc. rel. prn. *yám* are the same, and a tr. "whom [=Agni] they grasped in the company of

this god [=Agni]" is semantically and pragmatically excluded. The other standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) make pāda a into a full main cl. by supplying "(we are)." There doesn't seem to be any other acceptable solution; even if I were inclined to allow it to be a drastically fronted phrase from the main cl. of d (with two embedded rel. cl. in between), it is incompatible with that main cl., because, once again, Agni is an actor there. The publ. tr. simply ignores the problem, translating the loc. phrase without supplying main-cl. paraphernalia, with the rel. cl. of b hanging off *asyá devásya*. This actually works pretty well in translation – it's easy to forget that the "in the company" phrase has no syntactic home. I'm inclined to let the publ. tr. stand, while recognizing the syntactic problem in this comm. – though perhaps adding a dash after c.

Although I understand the reasons, I think that the meaning of the root √*grabh* 'grasp' in the publ. tr.'s "have accepted as their own" (*jagṛbhré* b) and "ownership" (*gṛ́bham* c), as well as "to be accepted" (*grábhāya* 8a), is too attenuated. The coercive aspect of seizure or grasping needs to be represented, in my view. I would alter the tr. to "whom mortals have grasped as their own, who is at home with the human grasp."

I would end the first sentence after c (with a dash; see above), and make d independent. The representation in the publ. tr., with "but" connecting c and d makes d appear to be part of the rel. cl. of c – but it cannot be since *śuśoca* is unaccented.

The phrase *durókam ... śuśoca* has to be interpr. in light of the cmpd *duróka-śocis-* 'whose blaze is beyond domestication' in I.66.5. The point in both passages is that though the fire may be housed on the hearth (ritual or otherwise), it is not so easily controlled. I would slightly change the tr. here to "Agni blazes for Āyu in a way that's hard to house," trying to capture the *uvoca* / *durókam* play. *Pace* Ge (n. 3d), I see no allusion to Agni's mythological flight in d.

VII.4.4: As disc. ad VII.1.19, I do not accept the Insler-Kü reinterpr. of the redupl. stem *juhŭr-* as belonging to √*hṝ* 'be angry', against the traditional ascription to √*hvṛ* 'go crookedly, go astray' (found in Ge and Re). Although the context here does not as strongly favor 'go astray' as in VII.1.19, it is perfectly compatible. I would emend the tr. to "Do not let us go astray here, o strong one." This verb form also presents a morphological problem: it is active, though the related forms are all middle (*juhūrthās* VII.19.1, *juhuranta* 2x, *juhurāṇá-* 5x; also perhaps *juhuré* ; see comm. ad V.19.2); it is apparently thematic, though the related forms are athematic. It cannot just be a subjunctive to the athematic stem because it's in a *mā́* prohibitive (as are all the finite forms except *juhuré*) and should be injunctive. KH, who cites all these forms (Injunk. 67), simply identifies it as a redupl. aor. (67 n. 115), flg. Th. (This identification is unlikely: if it were a redupl. aor., it should have a heavy reduplication.) A more elaborate explan. is given by Kü (603 and n. 1309), that it is analogically built beside a putative re-marked 3rd sg. middle **juhura + t* (apparently to a redupl. aor, though this is not made clear). This seems to require too much machinery and too many almost identical stems. I suggest that since the proper 2nd sg. mid. pf. injunc. *juhūrthās* found in VII.19.1 would not fit metrically here, a nonce active was created, perhaps enabled by 3rd pl. *juhuranta*, which can belong either to an athematic or a thematic stem. But I'm not particularly confident about this suggestion.

VII.4.5: I would substitute "embryo" for "child," esp. because the rest of the vs. supports this interpr.: *yóni-* 'womb' (a), *bibharti* 'bears' (d).

Supplying "(to sacrifice)" with *krátvā* does not seem to me strictly necessary. JPB must have been thinking of 9d in the previous hymn (VII.3): *devayájyāya sukrátuḥ* "strongly resolved to sacrifice to the gods" in his tr., and the supplied phrase does provide a reason (in this *hí* clause) for Agni's installing himself. However, *krátu-* doesn't usually appear with such a complement, and I would be inclined to leave it out.

I would substitute 'earth' for 'land'.

The singular verb *bibharti* agrees with the last in a series of subjects, sg. *bhū́miḥ*, as often.

VII.4.6–8: These three vss. (actually 2 ½: beginning with 6cd) sound the same theme as VII.1.11–12: the hope that we not be deprived of progeny. But they draw a much clearer distinction between offspring by blood and those with a different parentage. The phrase in VII.1.12, *svájanman- śéṣas-* "the posterity belonging to our own kin-group," is developed here by implicitly contrasting it with non-blood-kin, who are not to be incorporated into the family. The later dharmic provisions allowing for various types of sons by adoption and so forth have no place here.

I am not at all persuaded by Old's view that these vss. concern Agni's alienation and return home, nor by JPB's view (in the publ. intro.) that Agni, not a human son, is the topic here.

The lexeme *pári √sad* (6d, 7a) is found also in VII.1.11 in much the same context: the fear of "sitting around" the fire without progeny. As indicated in the comm. ad VII.1.11, I think the additive 'sit + around' is applicable in that vs. and – I would now say – in our 6d. It evokes the picture of the household members cheerfully encircling the domestic hearth – but with this cheer diminished by the lack of children. However, the usage in 7a *pariṣádyam* seems shifted, to two different idiomatic meanings: 'surround and besiege' (as in, e.g., X.61.13) and 'enclose and sequester'. (For details see comm. ad 7 below.) These less benign senses fit the harsher tone of vss. 7–8, rejecting non-kin. (There are numerous other interpr. of *pári √sad* and esp. *Paris ṣádyam* in this passage. See Old and the standard tr. I will not further engage with them.)

VII.4.6: The two clauses in the first hemistich can both be in the domain of the *hí* in pāda a (so publ. tr.), or b can be the main cl. to pāda a (so, e.g., Ge). In the latter case the *tíśe* of b owes its accent to its initial position. I favor the subord. cl. / main cl. interpr. Because Agni has control over the broad generic entities in pāda a, he then controls the power of giving more specific versions in b – gifts that can preserve us from the deprivations we envisage in cd.

Since *amṛ́ta-* is an adj. that can be used substantively, there is no way to determine whether we have two parallel adjectives without head nouns (as in the publ. tr. "what is free of death and abundant") or whether *bhū́reḥ* modifies substantivized *amṛ́tasya* (the other standard tr., e.g., WG "über viel Unsterblichkeit"). I prefer the publ. tr., since abstract *amṛ́ta-* is realized as concrete *vī́ra-* in b, as abstract *bhū́ri-* is as concrete *rayí-*.

The stem *suvī́rya-* is a neut. collective 'abundance of heroes' (despite its adjectival appearance and, no doubt, origin). It regularly appears independently; even

when it occurs with forms of *rayí-*, where Gr calls it "scheinbar adjektivisch" (e.g., I.129.7), it is better taken as a parallel noun in a phrase "wealth (and) an abundance of heroes."

Incorporating the different clausal configuration suggested above and the substitution of 'hero' for 'men', I would retr. the hemistich as "Because Agni is the master of what is free of death [=alive] and abundant, he is the master of the giving of wealth (and) of a mass of good heroes."

The publ. tr.'s "lacking lifebreath" (see also WG) for *ápsu-* follows Th's interpr. of *-psu-*; see EWA s.v. *psu-*.

The final term, the hapax *áduvaḥ*, presents potential morphological problems; the parallel terms, *avîrā(ḥ)* and *ápsavaḥ* are nom. pl. masc., but for *áduvaḥ* to have the same structure, it must belong to a stem *ádū-* (so Gr.), to a putative root √*dū*. Although this analysis is generally rejected (see esp. Re's n.) in favor of an analysis *á-duvas-* to the well-attested *s*-stem *dúvas-*, in fact several non-compounded occurrences of *dúvaḥ* must be pl. and point to at least a secondary root √*dū*. See Schindler (Rt Nouns 25) and comm. ad I.37.14, VI.29.3.

I would slightly retr. cd to "Let us not sit around you, o strong one, lacking heroes, lacking life-breath, lacking friendship."

VII.4.7: As noted above, *pariṣádyam* here has been interpr. in a number of ways. I am convinced that the idiom deliberately contrasts with *pári ṣadāma* in 6d and that the gerundive expresses a negative idiomatic sense of the lexeme. Pādas a and b must be contrastive, with *áraṇa-* 'alien, outside(r)' set against *nítya-* 'one's own'. At issue in this vs. are the two preoccupations of vs. 6: wealth and heroes (/sons). In the first hemistich of 7 we seem to be concerned with the former: wealth – esp. clearly in b "may we be lords of our own wealth" (*nítyasya rāyáḥ*). The corresponding term in pāda a is *rékṇaḥ* 'legacy, lit. what is left (behind)'. This word can and usually does refer to material goods and therefore matches *rāyáḥ* in b, but like *śéṣas-*, built to another root meaning 'leave', it can refer to the human legacy, i.e., offspring and descendants. Reading *réknas-* in these two different senses then invites reading *pariṣádyam* also in two different senses, both negative and neither one the simple additive one found in vs. 6. With *rékṇas-* as material legacy, the sense is 'surround and besiege'; in other words, the material legacy of the outsider is to be hostilely surrounded in order to take possession of it. But with *rékṇas-* as human legacy, the progeny of the outsider is to be enclosed and sequestered, kept separate from us and our breeding pool. This latter sense looks forward to 7cd and 8ab.

I would retr. ab as "Because the (material) legacy of the outsider is to be "sat around" [=surrounded and besieged] / the (human) legacy of the outsider is to be "sat around" [=enclosed and sequestered], may we be lords of our *own* wealth."

Pāda c "what is born of another is no posterity (for us)" (publ. tr.) is the negative counterpart of VII.19.12c *svájanmanā śéṣasā vāvṛdhānám* "(a dwelling) having increased through the posterity belonging to our own kin-group" – with both using the word *śéṣas-*.

Because *anyá-jāta-* implicitly contrasts with *anyódarya-* in 8b, I think *-jāta-* is more pointed than simply 'born' – rather 'begotten', with reference to the (biological) father.

The next question is what is the relevance of pāda d to all this. At least in the publ. tr., "Do not milk dry the paths (even) of an inconspicuous man" – not much! Since

the next vs. continues with the same theme of the unacceptability of non-kin, our pāda d should not be changing the subject: it must apply, one way or another, to what was stated in the rest of the vs. This suggests that it is aphoristic or metaphorical. Now the idiom *ví √duh* 'milk out, milk dry' generally has a metaphorical application. (On the idiom see esp. Narten, KlSch. 258–60, though I most emphatically do not subscribe to her explan. of our passage [n. 9] as a metaphor for human life.) It is also, at least once, somewhat slangy: see IV.24.9. In our context a reasonable metaphorical application of "milk dry" would be to a kinship lineage that has petered out, come to an end. In such a case "paths" could refer to the lines of descent, the paths from the ancestor to his descendants. As for *ácetāna-*, surely better 'unperceiving' than 'unperceived' (which must underlie JPB's "inconspicuous"). The unperceptive, or better 'heedless', man is one who pay no attention to the proper lines of descent and might be planning to fill out his legacy with sons born from others. I would therefore emend d to "Do not milk dry the paths [=lines of descent] of a heedless man."

A retr. of the whole vs.:

"Because the (material) legacy of the outsider is to be "sat around" [=surrounded and besieged] / the (human) legacy of the outsider is to be "sat around" [=enclosed and sequestered], may we be lords of our *own* wealth.

What is begotten by another is no posterity (for us). Do not milk dry the paths [=lines of descent] of a heedless man."

VII.4.8: The first hemistich of this vs. is perhaps the clearest rejection of non-blood kin, along with 7c.

As noted above ad vs. 3, "to be accepted" seems too weak and generic for *grábhāya*; I would prefer "to be grasped, to be embraced."

As I said just above, *anyódarya-* must contrast with *anyájāta-* (7c), with the latter referring to the son of a different father, the former to the son of a different mother – as in Ge's "aus anderem Mutterleib" (implied also by Re's "le ventre d'une autre" with fem.).

I would retr. ab as "For an outsider, however genial, is not to be embraced, (nor) is one coming from another's belly [=womb] to be considered with one's mind."

The publ. tr. of c, "He returns again to his home" is quite unforthcoming about the application of this statement in context. The point of the statement is that even if such an outsider is treated like one's own son, he will go back to his "home," that is, his blood kin (/ "birth parent[s]"). This is brought out most clearly in JSK's tr. (DGRV II.124) "He will still return (to his own) home (i.e., even if accorded the love of a natural son)."

Pāda d must be contrastive. The point seems to be that rather than casting around for someone who could count as a son, we should just pin our hopes on having a new, properly produced one appear, who will be far better than any makeshifts.

The long *ī* of the hapax *abhīṣā́ṭ* would metrically be better short; otherwise it gives an irregular late break. Arnold (126) is in favor of shortening it, with Old inclined that way, but more careful.

I would tr. the 2nd hemistich "He'll just go back home. To us let a victorious prize-winner come anew.

VII.4.9–10: Since the last two vss. of this hymn are repetitions, the theme of kindred versus non-kindred sons looms even larger, since the hymn essentially ends with emphatic treatment of it.

VII.4.9: This vs. is identical to VI.15.12. See comm. there.

VII.4.10: This vs. is identical to the last vs. of the preceding hymn, VII.3.10; see comm. there.

VII.5 Agni Vaiśvānara [SJ on JPB]

VII.5.1: Agni's epithet *vaiśvānará-* 'belonging to all men (*nṛ-*)' (d) is implicitly contrasted to *víśveṣām amṛ́tānam* "of all the immortals" in the preceding pāda – which itself is a lexical variant of the corporate entity Viśve Devāḥ "the All Gods."

I would substitute 'wakeful' for 'watchful': the priests are already awake when they tend the ritual fire at the dawn sacrifice (see, e.g., X.91.1). I am also inclined to take *vāvṛdhé jāgrvádbhiḥ* as a passive with agent: "he has been strengthened by the wakeful (priests)" – though the non-passive pf. part. *vāvṛdhānáḥ* in 2d gives me pause.

VII.5.2: Ge tr. *pṛṣṭáḥ* here as "erstarkt ward," with a n. to I.98.2, where, however, he tr. the same expression as "gesucht," which (n. 2a) he ascribes to *prach*, as do the standard tr. both there and here. Although Ge does not indicate the basis for his tr. here, *pṛṣṭá-* seems to be ascribed to a root *prakṣ*, related to *pṛkṣá-* 'strengthening nourishment'; see WG n. (though they do not accept this explan.). This meaning and deriv. are also reflected in KH, Injunc. 217, but are explicitly rejected in EWA, s.v. *PRAŚ*.

The accent on *dhā́yi* is plausibly explained by KH (Injunk. 217 n. 207) as "Spitzenstellung im antithetischen Satz."

VII.5.3–7: These five vss. are characterized by disyllabic verse/hemistich-opening forms of the 2nd sg. prn.: 3a *tvā́t*, 4a *táva*, 4c *tvā́m*, 5a *tvā́m*, 6a *tvé*, 6c *tvā́m*, 7c *tvā́m*, a pretty good representation of a versified paradigm. It is difficult to reproduce this effect in tr. without excessive artificiality, but the vss. could be rewritten as

3ab: From fear of you ... (or "it's from fear of you ...")
4ab: It's your commandment that H&E ..."
4cd: You stretch ... (or "it's you who stretch ...")
5ab: It's you that/whom the hymns follow ...
6a: In you did the good (gods) ... (or "it's in you that the good ...")
6cd: You drove ... (or "it's you who drove")
7cd: You, giving birth ... (or "it's you who, giving birth ...")

VII.5.3: On *asamaná-* see comm. ad I.140.4.

I would register the intens. part. by "constantly blazing."

Note the phonological play between *pūráve* (c) and *púro* (d). On Agni as a stronghold-breaker, see publ. intro. to VII.6 and comm. ad VII.6.1, 2.

VII.5.4: There is a difference of opinion on how to construe *tridhā́tu* – either to supply 'world' with it (Ge "die dreifache (Welt)"; sim. HPS [*vrata* p. 61], WG) -- referring presumably to Heaven, Earth, and the Midspace, then immediately doubled by H&E – or to take *tridhā́tu* as adverbial, pertaining to three divisions each of Heaven and Earth (so the publ. tr. and apparently Re). Either interpr. will license the pl. *sacanta*, as opposed to the dual that *prthivī́ utá dyaúḥ* might lead us to expect. I prefer the latter, because the doubling required by the former seems awkward.

Again, better "constantly blazing."

VII.5.5: It is unclear how many groups of fem. pl. entities are accompanying Agni here. Although all the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) think that all the fem. pl.s refer to the hymns (and this is more than possible), there could be as many as three groups: the *harítaḥ* "tawny mares" as Agni's flames, the hymns themselves (*gíraḥ*), and the ghee-rich (*ghṛtā́cīḥ*) ladles (see, e.g., VIII.64.5 *juhvàḥ ... ghṛtā́cīḥ*). Were we to subdivide the plurals this way, *dhúnayaḥ* "noisy, resounding" would modify the hymns. As for *vāvaśānā́ḥ*, this in part depends on which root it's assigned to: √*vāś* 'bellow' (so Gr, Kü 478–80, Sch 180, JPB, WG) and/or √*vaś* 'desire' (so Ge). I think it's possible to read it as both, "bellowing" and "yearning." As for how many groups of feminines are involved, I have no strong opinion – just that the various possibilities should be recognized.

VII.5.6: I would omit "their" in "their lordship"; there is no reason to assume it's theirs: the verb is active and there are no possessive expressions.

Although a presential interpr. of injunc. *juṣanta* (as in the publ. tr.) is certainly possible, it could alternatively be preterital ("found pleasure"), to match the preterital interpr. of injunc. *ny ṛ̀ṇvan* in the previous pāda for which b provides the cause. Or – yet another alternative – *ny ṛ̀ṇvan* could be presential: "they deposit ... for they find pleasure."

VII.5.7: The *sá* (a) doubling the (dropped) 2nd sg. subj. of indic. pres. *pāsi* (b) is in clear violation of my rules for *sá* with 2nd sg. reference: that the verb be imperative. (See my 1992 "Vedic 'sá figé': An inherited sentence connective?" [HF 105].) This is esp. noticeable because of the insistent 2nd sg. pronouns opening the three previous vss. However, the whole of pāda a has been borrowed from elsewhere (I.143.2=VI.8.8), with the trivial alteration of a Jagatī cadence (... *vʳyomani*) to our Triṣṭubh (... *vʳyoman*). In its other two occurrences, the subj. is 3rd person.

In order to make sense of *sadyáḥ* "at once," I would render *jā́yamānaḥ* as "upon being born." Note *janáyan* (6d), *jā́yamānaḥ* (here), *janáyan* (c), anticipating two occurrences of voc. *jātavedaḥ* (7d, 8b).

I would supply "(to them)" with "cry out.," with the other standard tr.

VII.5.8: As Re points out, the obj. of *pínva-* is often *íṣ-* (e.g., VII.24.6 *íṣam pinva*), which has here been shunted into the instr. in favor of objects that will benefit from the *íṣ-*. Re calls this switch "quelque peu irrationnelle," whereas I consider it a quietly clever twist on formulaic language.

VII.5.9: In keeping with my interpr. of *ní √yu* as 'hitch up (as a team)' (see comm. ad X.93.9), I would substitute "hitch up wealth ... for our generous patrons ..."

VII.6 Agni [SJ on JPB]

VII.6.1: The hapax *dārú-* is generally taken to mean 'breaker', from √*dṛ* 'break, split', often in the collocation *púram √dṛ* 'break/split the stronghold', frozen also in the cmpd. *puraṃ-dará-*, usually an epithet of Indra. As the publ. intro. argues, in cd the deeds of Agni are explicitly compared with those of Indra, and so calling him a 'breaker' would fit this aim – and as JPB also points out, the epithet *puraṃdará-* is applied to Agni in 2c. He also adduces a VP with Agni as subj. of √*dṛ* in X, but fails to cite the nearest one – in the immediately preceding hymn, VII.5.3d *púraḥ ... daráyan* "(Agni,) breaking/splitting the strongholds." In his 2023 diss. JC suggests (pp. 76–77) that *dārú-* here could (or could also) belong to √*dā* 'give' on the basis of a *dāru-* cited by Pāṇini P. 3.2.159. This is possible – certainly anything with a root syllable *dā-* can default to a 'give' interpr. – but the context here favors a first reading of 'breaker, splitter'. Ge (n. 1d, fld. by WG) has a more radical interpr: he takes *vánde dārúm* as a haplology of *vánde *vandārúm* "I praise *the praiser," based on I.147.2 *vandā́rus te tanvàṃ vande agne* "As extoller I extol your body (/myself), Agni." Although the stem *vandā́ru-* has the merit of existing (3x neut. sg., in addition to this masc.), note the difference in accent. I see no reason to emend, when the text as we have it makes sense.

There seem to be three verbs of praising in this vs., each likely construed with *prá*. In pāda a the initial *prá* combined with *práśastim* assumes a gapped form of √*śaṃs*; *prá ... vande* occupies parts of cd; and I would also supply (or utilize the *prá* of c) with final *vivakmi.* Note also that the finite verb *vánde* opening d gives way to the participle *vándamānaḥ* associated with the new finite verb *vivakmi*. This progression is not well signaled in the publ. tr. – in particular, the two finite verbs and the participle in d are entangled. I would retr. the first pāda as "I pro(nounce) the laud ..." And the second hemistich as "The deeds of the powerful one, like those of Indra, do I extol. Extolling the breaker, I proclaim (them)."

VII.6.3: The first hemistich has no finite verb, but a preverb *ní* and an abundance of acc. pls. Various verbs come to mind to supply; e.g., Re suggests *vivā́ya* from c, WG either *vivā́ya* or *cakā́ra* from d. However, since the English idiom "down with" works well in this negative context, I follow the publ. tr.

I am somewhat reluctant to render *-kratú-* as 'intelligence', outside its usual realm of 'will, intention, resolve'. Perhaps better 'without resolution" – i.e., those who act without a clear or principled purpose.

The stem *grathín-* is a hapax, but is obviously close in formation to *granthín-* (X.95.6) – both presumably lit. meaning 'having knots'. The latter is used in a simile comparing the group of Apsarases, the friends of Urvaśī, to lotuses – I tr. "interlaced," evoking the multiply overlapping leaves of lotuses in a pond. Here, contra the publ. tr., I do not think the Paṇis are deploying knots ("those tying in knots"), but are themselves tied up in knots and thus incapacitated; this interpr. would fit nicely with *akratú-* as 'without resolution'.

As for *aśraddhá-*, as I disc. ad VI.26.6 and at length in SW/SW (pp. 176–84), *śraddhā́-* in Vedic is not an abstract 'trust, faith', but a concrete "trust" in the workings of the social system that tacitly governs the Ārya community, often particularly specialized for hospitality. However I find the publ. tr.'s "not giving hospitality" too narrow, though I can't find a brief expression for what I do think it means – perhaps "without (mutual) trust."

I would retr. the hemistich as "Down with the irresolute ones tied up in knots, the ones with slighting speech – the Paṇis, lacking (mutual) trust, lacking strengthening, lacking sacrifice."

The two terms *ayajñá-* (b) and *áyajyu-* (d) ought to be distinguished, though they are applied to (roughly) the same people. The former must refer to sacrifice as the institution, whereas the latter describes the action of performing it.

Pāda d has a double acc. construction with √*kṛ*: "make X [into] Y." I think the publ. tr. has it backwards; instead of making those who are last into non-sacrificers (so the publ. tr.), it is surely, with the other standard tr., that the non-sacrificers are made to be last. I would retr. "He as first, has made the non-sacrificing ones to be last."

VII.6.4: "Most manly" would perhaps be less jarring as a description of a god than "best of men."

Pāda d = X.74.5, which I tr. "the unbowable one who subdues the battlers."

VII.6.4–5: Note the chaining of 4d *ánānataṃ damáyantam* with 5a *anamayat*, with the root of *ánānatam* and the morphology of *damáyantam* combined in *anamayat* to the rhyming roots √*nam* and √*dam*. In both instances of √*nam* I would prefer 'bow' to 'bend', which sounds rather trivial. Thus "unbowable" and "made the ramparts bow."

VII.6.5: Since the lexeme *ní* √*rudh* ordinarily means 'confine, pen in, trap, keep in check' (most notably in the famous Indra hymn I.32.11, where the waters confined by Vṛtra are compared to the cows confined by the Paṇi), I would emend the tr. here to "having held in check the (clans) of Nahus." As Ge points out (n. 5c), in I.31.11 Agni is called the Clanführer (*víśpati-*) of Nahuṣa, so his actions here must be relatively benign – organizing them into his tribute-bearing followers, rather than, say, trapping them.

VII.6.6: I would slightly emend from "has sat" to "has taken his seat."

VII.6.7: I very much doubt that *budhnyā́* means "on the land"; rather, flg. Gr, the *budhnyā́ vásūni* are the goods found at the bottom of the various places listed the abl. in cd – i.e., goods at the bottom of the lower sea, etc. I would retr. "the goods belonging to the depths."

VII.7 Agni [SJ on JPB]

VII.7.1: The isolated hapax 1st sg. *hiṣe* 'I (shall) urge on / impel' (√*hi*) has the appearance of the class of 1st sg. *-se* forms, esp. *stuṣe* 'I (shall) praise', over which much ink has been spilled. On the surface this form does not fit with the others semantically, because the rest cluster in the realm of praising. However, since the impulsion is produced by homage

(*námobhiḥ*) and the next pāda may be the poet's direct address to Agni, the semantics may be closer than first appears.

The function of *cid* is unclear: the publ. tr. renders *devám̐ cid* as "the very god," Re "le dieu lui-même." I am inclined towards Ge's "obwohl er ein Gott ist," which better fits the usual sense of *cid*. The point would be that though Agni is a god, I treat him like a horse. I would slightly emend the tr. to "... I shall spur on Agni, though a god, like a prizewinning horse ..."

The quotation marks around the tr. of pāda c in the publ. tr. must represent it as the poet's address to the god, the actual "spurring on" of pāda b. This 2nd sg. address contrasts with the 3rd ps. reference to Agni elsewhere in this vs., and thus may need such special treatment.

On *mitádru-* see comm. ad IV.6.5.

VII.7.2: On the non-causative value of *nadáya-* see comm. ad IX.97.13 and my *-áya-* monograph (60–61).

On *uśádhak* see comm. ad III.6.7 and 34.3 and Scar 197–99. Despite its anomalous accent, in this passage and III.34.3 I think the form is best interpr. as a masc. sg. root noun cmpd (as has been standard), rather than the neut. noun it appears to be in III.6.7.

VII.7.3: Most forms of the medial part. *huvāná-* are passive, even a number not so interpr. by Gr (e.g., V.43.10, VIII.74.13). However, there are some undoubted transitive forms, e.g., VII.30.3 in this maṇḍala. Against the publ. tr., but with the other standard tr. (and Gr), I would take the form here in the same way: "summoning here the two mothers ..."

As disc. ad nearby VII.4.2 as well as III.10.6, *yátaḥ √jan* has the idiomatic sense "as soon as born." I would emend the tr. to "as soon as you, the well-disposed, have been born, o youngest one."

VII.7.4: I would replace "at once" with "in an instant," referring to the rapid igniting of the ritual fire. This would work well with "as soon as you have been born" in the preceding pāda (3d).

On *rathirá-* see comm. ad X.76.7.

The nominal rel. cl. that ends the hemistich, *yá eṣām*, is located in the standard position for this kind of pseudo-izafe; its referent in the main cl. (*rathirám*) is quite distant and has led some to interpr. *yá* as *yé* (contra the Pp.) with immediately preceding plural referents (see Old). This produces less satisfying sense.

In c *viśā́m ... víśpatiḥ* belongs to the formulaic "throng-lord of throngs" construction; *pace* Gr and the publ. tr., the gen. *viśā́m* should not be construed with *duroṇé*. See III.2.10, 13.5, V.4.3, VI.1.8, IX.108.10, X.92.1, for the same phrase. Replace with "the clanlord of clans has been established in the house."

VII.7.5: Both *√sad* 'sit' and *√vṝ* 'choose' when used of Agni regularly refer to his being chosen and installed as Hotar. For the former, cf. III.4.4 (etc.) *ny àsādi hótā* ; for the latter X.52.1 (etc.) *hótā vṛtáḥ ... niṣádya*. Despite the absence of the preverb *ní*, I think that's what's at issue here: it is not that Agni was chosen as conveyor (so publ. tr.). I would recast pāda a as "Chosen (as Hotar), he has been installed, having coming here as the conveyor (of oblations)." My suggestion may seem to conflict with pāda d, where the

Hotar attracts Agni by sacrifice – but that Hotar is clearly the human one, and the two identities are played off against each other.

I would take *nṛṣádana-* not as 'the seat of men' (except secondarily), but, as commonly, 'the (ritual) session of men' (see comm. ad V.7.2). This is how the other standard tr. take it – esp. clearly Re "dans la session des seigneurs."

Note the inverse *ca* in c: *dyaúś ca ... pṛthivī́* ; see JSK, DGRV I.170–71.

The lexeme *ā́* √*yaj* does not mean merely 'sacrifice', but 'attract by sacrifice'. See comm. esp. ad III.4.2, where a form of Agni is obj. as here. I would substitute "whom the Hotar attracts here by sacrifice." This would fit with *ājaganvā́n* 'having come here' in pāda a.

Agni is here called *viśvávāra-* as were "the two mothers" in 3c.

VII.7.6: Although the Pp. reads *ā́-atiranta* in pāda a, unaug. *tiranta* is equally possible and, given unambig. injunc. *prá ... tiranta* in c, a better reading. The use of the same verb form with two different preverbs in two different idioms is pleasing, though it can't be captured in Engl.

In b the Pp. reads Saṃh *vā́ram* as *vā áram*, but Old casts strong doubt on this reading, among other things pointing to the two occurrences of *viśvávāra-* earlier in the hymn; see also JSK, DGRV II.207. (Ge, however, accepts the Pp. reading.)

The publ. tr. takes *vā́ram* as a parallel obj. with *mántram* ("fashioned the solemn utterance and its desirable reward"), but I am inclined towards the interpr. as double acc. with √*takṣ* given, e.g., by JSK: "fashioned the hymn into a desirable thing" (sim. WG).

The publ. tr. interpr. *śróṣamāṇā(ḥ)* as nom. pl. masc., but surely better with the other standard tr. (but not Gr) to take it as acc. pl. fem. modifying *víśaḥ*: "who further their obedient clans."

VII.8 Agni [SJ on JPB]

VII.8.2: The pass. aor. *avedi* could equally well belong to √*vid* 'know': "has become known as the very great one, the Hotar ..." Though perhaps the preterital form somewhat favors 'find'. Very little depends on the root assignment.

VII.8.3: The standard tr. (but not the publ. tr.) supply **svadháyā* with *káyā* in pāda a, based on *svadhā́m* in b. This does not seem necessary, since *káyā* appears as an independent adverbial interrogative also in V.12.3 and VIII.84.4. It does once appear with *svadháyā* (IV.13.5=14.5), but not in a context similar to this one.

There is some uncertainty about the root affiliation of *ví vasaḥ* (see Old's disc.), but the consensus view, which appears to be correct, is that it belongs with √*vas* 'shine', which appears regularly with *ví*. Although this subjunctive stem is not otherwise found in the RV, it is easily built to the root aor. stem found in the numerous *(vy) ā́vaḥ* forms to this root (e.g., I.113.9, VII.75.1, etc., all assigned to √*vṛ* 'cover' by Gr, but see a list in Lub s.v. √*vas*-$_1$ 'shine'). (Note that Agni is called *vivásvant-* in the next hymn, VII.9.3.) The somewhat confounding factor is the acc. *suvṛ́ktim*, which must be construed with it. WG take it as an acc. of goal, but best with Gaedicke (see WG n.) as an Inhaltsakk., as the publ. tr. seems to take it.

I would prefer "autonomous power" to "self-resolve" for *svadhā́m*.

Also a progressive interpr. of the pres. pass. part. *śasyámānaḥ* "while you are being proclaimed."

In d "hard-gained" seems somewhat distant from the usual senses of *duṣṭára-* 'difficult to surpass' (see, e.g., I.79.8, IX.63.11), etc., and I would emend the tr. in that direction.

VII.8.5: The 2nd sg. *śṛṇviṣe*, follows immediately on 3rd sg. *śṛṇve* in 4a, which provides a template for the somewhat anomalous formation with *śṛṇv-* (instead of **śṛnu-ṣe*), but this is not the case for the other three occurrences of *śṛṇviṣe* (IV.42.7, VIII.6.14, 33.10, 78.3).

I am at a loss about what to do with *cid* in c, which doesn't easily fit its usual senses 'even, although, also'. The publ. tr. "though praised, you are (already) renowned" is ingenious but, I think, imposes too much machinery, though it may be the best that can be done. Or perhaps, less insistently, "Just praised, you are reknowned ..." (This doesn't seem to be a problem that exercises other tr.)

VII.8.6: The most natural reading of this vs., found in Ge, Re, WG, and, partially, the publ. tr., is to take neut. *vácaḥ* as the subject of the whole vs. This interpr. causes morphosyntactic problems, however, in that three of the descriptors appear to be nom. sg. *masculine*; *śataśā́ḥ* (a), *dvibárhāḥ* (b), and *raksohā́* (d). To deal with this issue, Scar (583 n. 827) offers an alternative tr., with the apparent masc. forms in the first hemistich modifying an unexpressed nom. singer as subject and the one in d modifying unexpressed nom. Agni. Scar makes *vácaḥ* the obj. of *úd ... janiṣīṣta*. This immed. raises a different problem, namely that most (though, granted, by no means all) medial forms of √*jan* (outside of the *-anta* replacments) are intrans. 'arose, be born', not trans., as this interpr. requires. Moreover the apparent phrase *śatasā́ḥ sáṃsahasram* "winning hundreds along with thousands" has to be disjoined with the first word modifying the singer and the second modifying the speech. By contrast, I think the apparent masc. forms can be reconciled with neut. *vácaḥ*. First, *s*-stem cmpds not infrequently have *-ā́s* while seemingly modifying a neut.; not all the exx. can be explained away. See, for example, the same *dvibárhāḥ* in VII.24.2 (see comm. ad loc., also ad II.31.5). As for *śatasā́ḥ* to the root √*sā*, it is difficult how to imagine how a neut. form could be made to a long-*ā* root noun: the usual practice of using the bare stem would yield a cmpd that certainly doesn't look neuter. Reinforced by *dvibárhāḥ*, the normal masc. *śataśā́ḥ* can easily pass for neut. Acdg. to Lanman (Noun Inflec. 445), "About eight [neut. nominative sj] forms occur with long *ā*, which are used as neuters and end in *-s*. Since a true neuter form with masculine case-ending is quite unexampled, we are perhaps forced to the conclusion that masculine forms have here been used in default ..." Among the forms he cites is ours here. (Cf. the neut. sg. *sthā́(ḥ)* in the formula *sthā́ jágat* "the still and the moving" (3x), which may well have a final *-s*; see comm. ad I.80.14.) The same considerations will account for *rakṣohā́* : making a neut. is challenging to a root noun in *-n*. If it were modeled on the neut. to derived *n*-stems, we should have **rakṣohá*, which is insufficiently characterized. Lanman (Noun Inflec. 478) identifies only one neut. in radical *-n*, the instr. *dasyu-ghn-ā́*, which does not have that problem because it has an oblique case ending.

As just noted, JPB interpr. ab with *vácaḥ* as subj., but takes Agni to be the subj. of cd. This is more justifiable than reconfiguring ab and would solve the problem of *rakṣohā́*. However, it requires the neuter phrase *dyumád amīvacā́tanam* to modify *śám*, and I'm not

at all sure this indeclinable accepts modifiers. I would offer the alt. tr. "which [=speech] will become luck for the praisers and their/its friend [=Agni; for Agni as *āpí-* see I.26.3, 31.16, etc.], the brilliant smasher of demons, chasing sickness into hiding."

VII.9 Agni [SJ on JPB]

In the publ. intro. in the penultimate sentence, "in vs. 5" should be changed to "in vs. 6" and "the" should be deleted before Jarūtha.

VII.9.2: The *sá ... yáḥ* construction of pāda a, with the main cl. nominal, is not reflected in the publ. tr. I would emend to "He is the very resolute one who (opened) the doors of the Paṇis, purifying the chant ..."

A verb has to be supplied in the rel. cl. I would favor a preterital reading (contra the publ. tr. and the other standard tr.), since this is, after all, mythology. The standard root in this formula ("open up the doors") is √*vṛ*, and it is tempting to think that the poet had in mind the aor. *ā́var*, as in I.113.4 ... *ví dúro na āvar* (sim. V.45.1). In pausal and pre-voiceless sandhi this verb presents as *ā́vaḥ*, which is identical to underlying *ā́vas* 'shone' to √*vas* (see comm. ad nearby VII.8.3, also 75.1). Note that Agni is called *vivásvān* in the next vs. (3a), and see *ví vasaḥ* in the preceding hymn (VII.8.3). In other words, what I'm suggesting is a pun based on a form that has to be supplied in the text – there's nothing on the surface except for the triggering preverb *ví* : Agni (opened) up (*ví ... ā́var*) the doors as the one who (shone) widely (*ví ... ā́vas*). Although this suggestion may seem excessively tricky, that particular pun is often instantiated, and our poet seems to be setting it up to be intuited here.

hótā mandráḥ recurs from 1b, while the final word of 1b, *pāvakáḥ*, is picked up by the part. *punānáḥ*.

Acdg. to Kü (633–34), the med. pf. of √*dṛś* is presential, and "is visible" would work as well as "has become visible" here.

VII.9.3: The only word in 1b not represented in vs. 2 is *kavítamaḥ*, which finds its repetition in pāda a *kavíḥ* of this vs.

As just indicated, I think *vivásvān* is responding to the buried pun on *ā́vaḥ* in vs. 2. I would therefore slightly emend to "... Vivasvant (/shining forth)"

Note the near identity between *áditiḥ* (c) and *átithiḥ* (d), in the same metrical position.

On *(su-)saṃsád-* see Scar 574–75.

The "fruitful ones" are the plants most likely (so Ge, Re, WG), though Scar (621) allows for the possibility of the waters.

VII.9.4: It is unclear whether the rel. cl. of c leans left or right. The publ. tr. (also Scar 105, WG) opt for the latter, with c preposed to the main cl. in d. Ge and Re take it rather with what precedes. I am inclined towards their interpr. with c dependent on ab, though nothing really rides on the decision. Such a configuration would be smoother if the aor. *aśucat* is tr. "has blazed" rather than simply "blazed."

As for *samanagā́-*, in the publ. intro. JPB asserts that this cmpd expresses "battle imagery," tr. "entering the melee" (similarly explicit Ge). This is possible: *sámana-* does sometimes refer to the crowded battlefield – but more often it is used of festive gatherings,

often attended by young women, presumably a sort of marriage mart. Even the clearest "battle" passages (see esp. VI.75.3–5) rest on metaphors or similes involving young women attending the *sámana-*. The only other occurrence of the cmpd. *samanagā́-*, in I.124.8, is found in such an explicit simile, and the only occurrence of *sámana-* in this Agni cycle, in VII.2.5, involves a simile with unmarried girls being anointed at (marriage-)assemblies. I therefore think it's unlikely that a battle image is meant here at all — or, if so, it is a dim second to "(festive) assembly," which here would mean the ritual scene itself (so Re). I would therefore retr. b and c as "... entering the assembly, Jātavedas has blazed, / (he) who radiates forth ..."

VII.9.5: The expression *mā́ riṣaṇyaḥ* (also II.11.1, X.22.15; sim. *mā́ riṣaṇyata* VIII.1.1, 20.1) is generally taken as an idiom meaning "don't make a mistake / don't fail" (Ge, Re, etc.). KH (Injunk. 80) ups the ante, as it were, by attempting to interpr. this idiom as an inhibitive *mā́* construction, because it contains the present stem *riṣaṇyá-*. His interpr. is best represented in WG's "Schlage nicht länger fehl," which seems an impertinent way to address the god Agni. Although I have long resisted the idiomatic reading of this phrase, I now accept the justice of it (though not in KH's extended formulation). Although the stem outside of the *mā́* phrase does seem to mean literally 'do/intend harm' – see, e.g., II.23.12 *ádevena mánasā yó riṣanyáti* "who, through his godless thinking, intends harm," with the parallel verb *jíghāṃsati* 'wishes to smash', of one of our enemies – in the stripped-down phrase with *mā́* it is better interpr., essentially, as "don't screw up" (though in more elegant language). I can see this as a development of something like "do no harm." I would therefore emend the tr. of pāda a to "O Agni, travel on your mission toward the gods—don't fail!—"

The publ. tr. seems to interpr. the instr. phrase *brahmakṛ́tā gaṇéna* as an instr. of accompaniment ("along with the band that creates poetic formulations"), but if this refers to the human poets, as seems likely, the tr. is conceptually off – those poets should not be going to heaven with Agni. Both Ge and Re supply "sent" to construe with the instr.: Ge: "von der erbauenden (Sänger)schar (gesandt)." Although I am reluctant to supply crucial pieces of sentence structure out of nowhere, this seems to be the most likely way to rescue the sense. Alternatively, since the same instr. phrase, used of the Maruts, is found in III.32.2 (*brahmakṛ́tā mā́rutena gaṇéna*), the reference here could be to the Maruts as well, who would be more plausible traveling companions for Agni than human poets. Indirect support for an accompaniment reading might come from VII.10.4: *bṛ́haspátim ṛ́kvabhir* "Bṛhaspati along with the reciters of verses," where the *ṛ́kvan-* must be gods. (See comm. ad loc.) However, the fact that Agni is commanded to sacrifice to the Maruts, in addition to a host of other gods, in the next hemistich makes this less likely. I would emend the tr. to "(sent) by the band that creates poetic formulations."

VII.9.6: Since *idhāná-* is an aor. part. and since the action is not simultaneous with the main verb *han*, I would tr. "having kindled you."

In the other two appearances of Jarūtha, it is Agni who does him in: nearby VII.1.7 and X.80.3, the latter of which gives slightly more information. In both cases Agni burns him up.

What root to assign *jarasva* to ('awake'? 'sing'?) is difficult to determine; see Old's lengthy disc. of *járate* ad loc. Ge goes for 'sing' (so also Gotō [1st class, 154] and

WG]), while Re prefers ‘awaken’ (with the publ. tr.). I in fact have no settled opinion, in part because *puruṇīthá-* is a puzzle. However, I doubt that this cmpd. means straightforwardly Gesänge, per WG (< *aus vielen Führungen, das ist Singweisen oder Melodien, bestehend). The stem *nīthá-*, esp. in the cmpd *sunīthá-*, seems to mean ‘guidance, conduct’. Although the āmreḍita *nīthé-nīthe* in VII.26.2 is parallel to *ukthá-ukthe*, I do not think (with Gr) that it means ‘song’ there, but rather a contrastive ritual notion, the guiding or conduct of the ritual itself. Here I would be inclined to tr. “Awaken with your (activity) that has many modes” with *puruṇīthā̆* an instr. sg. (so apparently Ge), rather than acc. pl. (Re, WG, JPB). The publ. tr. cannot be correct in any case because *puruṇīthá-* should be a bahuvr. and it is tr. as a karmadhāraya (“many modes”).

VII.10 Agni [SJ on JPB]

On the sonic effects in the hymn, see publ. intro.

VII.10.1: The first word, *uṣáḥ*, is one of the rare examples of this famous (famous to IEists anyway) gen. form, with zero-grade of the *-as*-suffix and simplification of the geminate (approx. **uṣ-ṣ-ás*), which has generally been restored to full-grade *uṣásaḥ* in the RV. The same simile, *uṣó ná jāráḥ*, is found in I.69.1. That the form is a gen. is supported by the same formula, but plural, in the preceding hymn: VII.9.1 *jārá uṣásām*.

On the phrase *pájo aśret* see nearby VII.3.4 and also III.14.1, with comm. To harmonize with these other occurrences I would slightly emend the tr. to “has fixed his broad countenance.” On *pájas-* see comm. ad I.58.5.

Pāda b opens and closes with two undoubted intens. participles, *dávidyutat* and *śóśucānaḥ*. The middle part., *dīd^{i}yat*, is contextually ambiguous: it belongs to the redupl. pres. that has been created on the basis of reanalysis of the presential perfect *dīdā̆ya*. Our participle definitely belongs to a pres. system, given its *-a(n)t-* suffix (versus well-attested pf. *dīdivā̆ṃs-*) and accent on the redupl. But with its long redupl., it could be taken as belonging to an intensive in this context, rather than a straight 3rd cl. pres. To bring out the intens. value of at least the first and last words, I would emend the tr. to “constantly flashing, shining, blazing.”

VII.10.1–2: Note the parallelism of the b pādas, with both morphological matching (pres. mid. part.) and phonological identity (*uś...*).

1b *dhíyo hinvānā́ uśatīḥ*

2b *yajñáṃ tanvānā́ uśíjo*

VII.10.2: The plural part. *tanvānā̆(ḥ)* is jarring; the referent should be sg. Agni. It is esp. surprising because of the parallelism just noted, where in 1b a similar mid. part. modifying Agni, *hinvānā́(ḥ)*, is unambig. sg. The most likely explan. is that it has been “attracted” to the pl. *uśíjaḥ* in the simile. To signal the grammatical mismatch it might be better to tr. “(stretching forth) the sacrifice, like fire-priests stretching their thoughts.”

The configuration of two accented preverbs, *ā́ ví*, immediately followed by the part. *vidvā̆n*, is surprising. We would expect at least *ví* to be univerbated with the part. as **vividvā̆n*. However, note that in I.189.7 we also find doubly accented *ví vidvā̆n* # in a similar formula. I would suggest that the accent on *ví* in both instances is to preclude

interpr. the univerbated form *vividvā́n* as belonging to √*vid* 'find', with its redupl. pf. *vivéda*, including a pf. act. part. of this same shape.

The *ā́* is more puzzling. Though Gr lists *ā́ ví* as a preverb combination with √*vid*, in fact, as far as I can see, this is the only passage he lists with that pair. Such a combination would be anomalous: ordinarily *ā́* is the second of any two preverbs, incl. *ví* (e.g., *vy-ā* √*kṛ*, √*viś*, √*vṛt*, etc.). The only supposed instance of the opposite order I know of is *ā́ ví* √*bhā*, but in the two possible exx. (I.71.6 and II.8.4) the *ā́* should be interpr. otherwise. I don't quite know what to do with it here; I'm inclined to take it as adverbial, contrasting what Agni does "here" (on earth, on the ritual ground) with his journey as messenger to the gods in the next pāda. JPB seems to take it as the signal for a gapped verb of motion ("comes"), but I think Agni is already here and doesn't need to come here, but rather to go yonder.

My flip in direction from the publ. tr. (from "come" to "go") is based in great part on my interpr. of *devayā́vā*, which JPB renders as "seeking the gods." But on the basis of the numerous *-yā́van-* cmpds, like *puro-yā́van-* 'going in front', *prātar-yā́van-* 'traveling in the early morning', *yā́van-* means 'going' -- in this cmpd 'going to the gods' (so Gr, Re, WG, prob. Ge). I would retr. the 2nd hemistich "Distinguishing the breeds (of gods and mortals) here, the god Agni (is) going to the gods at speed ..."

The last word of the vs., *vániṣṭhaḥ*, may be a low-level echo of the poet's name Vasiṣṭha. The only other occurrence of this stem, in VII.18.1, participates in a complex pun on this name; see publ. intro. to that hymn comm. ad VII.18.1 and 4.

VII.10.3: I would here tr. *devayántīḥ* as 'seeking the gods', as usual, rather than 'serving the gods' – against JPB's 'seeking the gods' for *devayā́vā* in 2d (see comm. just above). The point is that the hymns, etc., want to reach the gods, so they come to Agni, who will convey them there along with the oblations. Agni's role as messenger was emphasized in 2d.

VII.10.4: The two models of sacrifice – the sacrifice goes to the gods in heaven / gods come from heaven to the sacrifice – flip here, as they do so often. As I have often remarked, the Vedic poets clearly see no contradiction in combining the two models in the same hymn (beginning with I.1) or even the same vs. (see VII.11.5 in the next hymn).

Pāda-final *sajóṣāḥ* should be construed with acc. sg. *índram*, though it is obviously not an acc. sg. m. On the reinterpr. of *sajóṣās* as an honorary adverb, see comm. ad VII.3.1.

The three instr. pl.s should all identify the groups accompanying the god named in the acc. The third pair might give us pause: *bṛ́haspátim ṛ́kvabhiḥ* "Bṛhaspati with the reciters of verses" *if* the *ṛ́kvan-* are taken as human ritualists. However, as disc. ad X.64.4, this stem often refers to divinities – sometimes explicitly the Maruts (V.52.1, 60.8). In conjunction with Bṛhaspati, the Aṅgirases would make better sense, since they are partners with Bṛhaspati in opening the Vala cave.

VII.10.5: On *kṣápāvān ... rayīṇā́m* see disc. of the same phrase in I.70.5, where I see a pun with *kṣáp-* 'night'.

The impf. *abhavat* would be better tr. 'became', not 'has become'.

VII.11 Agni [SJ on JPB]

VII.11.3: On the baffling phrase "three times at night" see the publ. intro. I have nothing to add to its interpr.

In view of the somewhat puzzling use of *abhíśasti-* in nearby VII.13.2 (q.v.), I would change "curse" here to "calumny" or "blame."

VII.11.4: Pāda c is quite like nearby VII.5.6b and should be harmonized: I suggest "... take pleasure in his resolve."

VII.11.5: The two models of sacrifice mentioned ad VII.10.6 are present within a single vs., ab versus c.

Pāda b makes a minor ring with 1b: ... *amṛ́tā mādayante* (1b) / *índrajyeṣṭhāsaḥ ... mādayantām*. Although the repetition seems rather trivial, it in fact conceals something more interesting: in vs. 1 the immortals *don't* reach exhilaration in the absence of Agni, but by the final verse there is hope that they will, with Agni's ministrations.

VII.12 Agni [SJ on JPB]

VII.12.1: The rel. cl. of b, with Agni in the nom., interrupts the long NP in the acc.: ... *yáviṣṭham* (a), ..., *citrábhānum* ... and thus appears to be technically embedded in the main cl., though the effect in context is like just another descriptor of Agni in a series.

VII.12.2: The *naḥ* in Wackernagel's position in pāda c is expanded into a bipartite NP in pāda d.

VII.13 Agni [SJ on JPB]

VII.13.1: The publ. tr. takes *yátaye* as a (pseudo-)infinitive, though with gen. rection. Alternatively "to V., to the controller of our thoughts."

VII.13.2: As with VII.10.1, I would register the intens. *śóśucānaḥ* as "constantly blazing."

Pāda c "You released the gods from the curse" (*abhíśaster amuñcaḥ*) is puzzling: *what* curse? I do not, offhand, know of a story or allusion to the gods being cursed (by whom? what?), then freed by Agni. It is in fact difficult to imagine what negative verbal product (derived from *abhí √śaṃs*) could be directed at the gods and removed by Agni. (This problem is not mentioned by the standard tr.) However, "calumny" or perhaps "blame," (falsely) directed at the gods by misguided mortals, is at least more plausible than "curse." (See also Re's "la parole-agressive.") For *abhíśasti-* see also above, ad nearby VII.11.3, as well as X.164.3.

VII.14 Agni [SJ on JPB]

VII.14.1: Because of the concentration of forms or *√śuc* in this Agni cycle (see, in the preceding hymns, VII.1.4, 2.1, 5.3, 4, 8.1, 4, 9.4, 10.1 [2x], 13.1, 2, and in the following,

VII.15.5, 10, 16.3), with the intens. part. *śóśucāna-* esp. frequent, I would prefer to register the etymological figure in the bahuvr. *śukrá-śocis-*: 'of blazing blaze', however inelegant this is in English. See the same adj. in the next hymn, VII.15.10.

VII.14.2: This Triṣṭubh vs. is a variant of vs. 1 in Bṛhatī. The *samídhā* of 1a recurs in 2a, fitted out with a verb. The opening of b, *vayáṃ dāśema* is identical to that of 1b but is expanded differently. The *havírbhiḥ* of 1c is reprised by *havíṣā* in 2d, with *bhadraśoce* in that pāda a variant of *śukráśociṣe* in 1c. Only pāda c is made of new material (save for the *vayám*).

As in vs. 1, I would tr. the √*śuc* form with 'blaze': 'of auspicious blaze'.

VII.14.3: This vs. too has strong echoes of vs. 1, though the content is different. Note *deváhutim* recalling *deváhūtibhiḥ* in 1b and *dā́śataḥ syāma* "may we be those offering service" as a variant of *vayáṃ dāśema* (1d, 2b).

VII.15 Agni [SJ on JPB]

VII.15.1: This verse is oddly disjointed syntactically. The skeleton of the main cl., pāda b, is "pour the oblation in (his) mouth." The "mouth" is of course Agni's: this is the standard trope of Agni as the mouth through which the gods consume the oblations. So we might expect the representation of Agni to be in the genitive ("in the mouth of [Agni...]"), but instead he occupies the first pāda – in the dative, the usual case of the recipient of √*hu* 'pour'. Then the rel. cl. of c is a nominal equational cl., but equating masc. *yáḥ*, referring to Agni, with the neut. abstract phrase *nédiṣṭham ā́pʲyam* "nearest friendship" rather than a personal term like 'friend' (cf. VIII.60.10 *nédiṣṭham ... āpím*, of Agni). (Granted that *āpíḥ* 'friend' wouldn't work metrically here, but RVic poets are metrically resourceful and an equivalent phrase could surely have been devised.) WG take it as an instantiation of the idiom, *idám* √*as* / *bhū* "etwas innehaben / innehaben werden," with reff. to Gaedicke, KH, and Gotō. Although this is possible, I tend to think of that idiom as a more restricted one, with only a few possible predicates.

VII.15.2: This vs. consists entirely of a rel. cl. (unless pāda c is an unsignaled nominal main cl.); it could depend either on vs. 1 or vs. 3. Though the rel. cl. of 1c might suggest parallel construction here, I think, with Ge, Re, and the publ. tr., that it is more likely that vs. 3 provides the main cl., with resumptive *sá* beginning that vs. The same configuration is found in vss. 5–6, which supports this interpr. here.

Ge (n. 2a) provides abundant parallels for *páñca carṣaṇī́r abhí*, which regularly appears in this form without associated verbal form, though some form of √*as* (*abhí* √*as* 'dominate, surmount') can be assumed.

VII.15.2–3: Note three different words relating to the house(hold): 2b *dáme-dame*, 2c *gṛhá-*, 3a *amā́tya-*.

VII.15.4: JPB and WG (also Gotō 1st cl. 284) interpr. the redupl. aor. injunc. *jījanam* as presential ("I give birth"; "... erzeuge ich"); Ge and Re as future ("... will ich ... hervorbringen"; "je m'en vais ... engendrer"); KH (Injunk. 222 and esp. 253) as

immediate future. None of them gives arguments in favor of the interpr. Both pres. and future are certainly possible readings, but given the relative rarity of this redupl. aor., I assume the aor. stem was chosen apurpose and am in favor of an aoristic immediate past sense: "I have just now given birth to a new song." Neither the *návam* nor the *nú* is an impediment to this interpr.

The gen. *vásvaḥ* with *vanãti* is somewhat surprising; see Re's attempt (in his n.) to justify a partitive gen., as what he rather charmingly calls "Gén. de modestie." If we take the partitive gen. seriously, with a 'win' reading of *vanãti*, it would seem that we have quite low, indeed demeaning, expectations of Agni: "surely he will win *some* goods for us." However, as disc. ad V.65.1, 4, with reference to Gotō (1st cl., 283–86; see also Kü 447–51, esp. 449), the root √*van* should actually be separated into two, 'win' and 'desire, cherish', whose forms are hopelessly entangled, esp. the *vána-* stem. Gotō (284), fld. by Kü (449), assigns this form to the latter root and tr. "Wegen [dieses] Gutes wird er uns gewiss lieben," taking *vásvaḥ* as an abl. of cause, referring to the praise, and *naḥ* as the obj. of the verb. This free-floating abl. seems to me at least as troubling as the partitive gen. object. WG (i.e., Gotō, who is responsible for the tr. of Maṇḍala VII) substitute what seems to me a more satisfactory interpr.: "Ob er an unserem Gut Gefallen finden wird?" with gen. *vásvaḥ* as the obj. Oblique objects with verbs of desiring, enjoying, etc., are reasonably common both in Skt. (see, e.g., the case frames with √*juṣ*) and cross-linguistically. I would therefore substitute here "Surely he will cherish our good thing [=praise]."

VII.15.5–6: As in vss. 2–3, a verse consisting entirely of a rel. cl. (5) is resumed by the main cl. in the flg. vs. (6).

VII.15.5: I would substitute "who blazes" for "who flames," to match the numerous other occurrences of √*śuc*; see comm. ad VII.14.1.

VII.15.6: The injunc. *juṣata* may be a case in which the modally and temporally unmarked injunc. acquires the mood/tense of the preceding verb, in this case impv. *vetu* – hence a tr. "let Agni take pleasure ..." vel sim. This is, in any case, how the other standard tr. render it.

VII.15.7: I might tr. the voc. phrase *nakṣya viśpate* as "o clanlord, (easy) to approach."

VII.15.7–8: Note the epithet *suvîra-* applied to Agni in 7c, 8c.

VII.15.8: The pl. bahuvr. *svagnáyaḥ* modifying *vayám* can of course mean either "having good fire/Agni" or "having good fires." Contra the publ. tr., the other st. tr. take it as underlyingly singular. This is quite possible, but the pl. can be supported: we have good fires (three of them) on the ritual ground.

I would tr. *asmayúḥ* as 'inclined towards us" rather than "seeking us." In any case, pādas bc economically express the reciprocal relationship between Agni and his worshipers.

VII.15.9: On the phrase *ákṣarā sahasríṇī* see comm. ad VII.1.14, where I argue that 'having thousands" (*sahasrín-*) does not mean "bringing thousands (of prizes, vel sim.)," but rather "having thousands (of parts = syllables, words)." I would emend the tr. of c to "as does their syllable [/their inexhaustible cow] having a thousand (parts = syllables, words)."

VII.15.10: Three occurrences of the root √*śuc* in a single (24-syllable) vs. To bring out this concentration, I would retr. the vs. "Agni wards off demonic forces – the immortal one of blazing blaze / the blazing pure one to be invoked."

VII.15.11: Note that *rādhāṃsi* echoes *rákṣāṃsi* in 10a, in the same metrical position, though of course the two have opposing values.

In c "us" should probably be deleted: the *naḥ* in pāda a belongs to a different clause. Of course, we are the desired recipients, but this is not overtly stated.

VII.15.11–12: On *dātu vā́r*$^{\text{j}}$*yam* # (11c) and *dāti vā́r*$^{\text{j}}$*yam* # (12c) and their relation to the much-discussed cmpd *dā́ti-vāra-*, see my "Vedic Evidence for the Verbal-governing *dā́ti-vāra* 'Type': A Critical Reassessment," IEL (2024): 1–18, esp. 12–16. The impv. *dātu* in this phrase has been generated by the (prob. root aor. subj.) *dāti* in the next vs.

VII.15.12: I would dispute the account of Diti given in the publ. intro., which attempts to connect this figure with Aditi and the Ādityas more generally and suggests that Diti is one of Aditi's children. It also claims that Diti is more likely male than female. To begin with the last – this is highly unlikely: *-ti*-stem abstracts are reliably feminine, and this stem obviously began life as the abstract to √*dā* 'give', even though it has been (partially) animatized to a figure capable of agency, of performing the action that her underlying root expresses. There is, obviously, some play with the goddess Aditi, who, however, is nowhere to be found in this hymn, and an association in this vs. with the minor Āditya, Bhaga, and with Savitar, who is sometimes associated with minor Ādityas. But here I think Diti has been wholly generated from the VP of which she is the subject: "'Giving' will give ..."

As disc. in my article referred to just above, the problematic verb *dāti* is probably a root aor. subjunctive. I would therefore retr. pāda b and c here as "And god Savitar and Bhaga (will give) / and Diti ("Giving") will give a desirable reward." As with 11 "to us" should be deleted.

VII.15.13: I prefer "burn against" for *práti* √*dah* to "burn back."

VII.15.15: In order to distinguish this phrase, with *pāhi*, from the nearly identical one in 13a with *rakṣā*, I would substitute "protect" for "guard."

I would substitute "o illuminator of the evening" for "o you dawning in the evening."

VII.16 Agni [SJ on JPB]

VII.16.2: The tr. of cd follows Old, as do all the other standard tr.

VII.16.3: I would replace "flame" with "blaze" for *śocíḥ*, to connect it with all the other forms of √*śuc* in this Agni cycle. See comm. ad VII.14.1.

VII.16.4: The *tád* of d picks up and summarizes the neut. pl. *víśvā ... martabhójanā* in c.

VII.16.5: Change the tr. to "at our rite"; *naḥ* was omitted in the publ. tr.

Given the *vītáye* in 4b, best to match the tr. of *véṣi* : I would substitute "pursue a desirable reward."

VII.16.6: The publ. tr.'s appositive relation "us – every priest" (*... naḥ ... víśvam ṛtvíjam*) follows Ge. There are several other ways to take this phrase. Re considers "us" a separate but parallel entity to every priest: "nous ... (ainsi que) tout officiant et celui ..." (Apparently also WG, though it is less clear.) The *naḥ* could also be gen. "our every priest" or dat. "sharpen for us every priest ..." I would prefer any of the last three options over the publ. tr. (/Ge), since I find the number clash "us -- every priest" jarring.

I would prefer to express a closer causal relationship between *suśáṃsaḥ* amd the verb *dákṣate* in d. Better "and who shows skill as the one with good pronouncement."

VII.16.7: Against the otherwise universal agreement that *dáyanta* belongs to √*dā* 'divide, distribute', WG take it to the non-existent root √*dā* 'destroy' (see comm. ad II.31.5), championed by Gotō (1st cl. 172–74). Here that interpr. is esp. bizarre because in the WG tr. the subj. of *dáyanta* has to be generated from gen. pl. *jánānām*, via a rel. cl. ("... der Leute die ... zerstören sollen"). But the rel. prn. *yé* cannot be trifled with in that way – it's firmly in the cl. with *maghávānaḥ* 'bounteous ones' (=our patrons) as its referent. In other words, this interpr. is syntactically impossible, even if the root √*dā* 'destroy' existed.

VII.16.8: The rt. noun cmpd *dīrghaśrút* is universally taken (incl. Scar 555) as modifying neut. acc. *śárma*, and that is possible. However, it could also modify Agni, the gapped 2nd sg. subj. of *yáchā*, and this interpr. makes more sense to me, esp. as Agni is called *dīrghaśrúttamaḥ* in VIII.102.11. I would substitute, "As far-famed one, hold out shelter to us."

VII.16.9: Ge and WG take ab as a nom. clause in the 3rd ps. ("Er ist ..."). This is certainly possible, but construing the whole vs. as a 2nd ps. impv. cl., with Re and the publ. tr., seems preferable, since it is surrounded by 2nd ps. addresses to Agni. The *sá* beginning the vs. is simply the *sá* commonly found with 2nd ps. impvs. (here *ā́ vaha ... sūdaya* in cd), as disc. at length in my 1992 "*sá* figé" article (HS 105).

The conjoined phrase *mandráyā ca jihváyā ... āsā́* "with your delighting tongue and your mouth" has an inverse *ca* (see JSK DGRV I.176).

VII.16.11: Pāda b *pūrṇā́ṃ vivaṣṭy āsícam* has as its counterpart the post-(late-)caesura phrase *pūrṇā́ṃ vaṣṭy āsícam* in the Jagatī vs. II.37.1. The verb there belongs to the well-attested root pres. to √*vaś* ; the redupl. pres. in our passage is the only such form in the RV or elsewhere -- the SV *vivaṣṭu* is simply a variant of this passage -- and appears to

have been artificially created to fill out the necessary extra syllable, an explanation owing to Joachim (151). The other form of the supposed redupl. pres. *vavákṣi* (VIII.45.6), with different redupl. vowel, seems likewise artificial. See comm. ad loc. In other words, there's good reason to think that this root does not have a 3rd class pres.

The orig. subjunctive identity of the 3rd sg. *ohate*, which has become attenuated in some passages (see comm. ad X.65.10), is fully on display here.

VII.17 Agni [SJ on JPB]

VII.17.1: I would prefer "become kindled" with the dynamic sense of *bháva.*

VII.17.3: For pāda b I prefer the tr. of the identical phrase in III.6.6 "Perform good rites, Jātavedas." The publ. tr. seems to be representing a double acc. construction, which is not in the text.

VII.17.4: I would likewise emend this variant of 3b to "he will perform good rites."

VII.17.6: Better "established" rather than "have established," as this act belongs to the hoary past.

VII.18 Indra (Battle of the Ten Kings)

I have little or nothing to contribute to the interpr. of this famous hymn, esp. of its historical or quasi-historical aspects. The hymn has been extensively treated by a number of scholars both fairly recently, esp. H.-P. Schmidt (*Indica* 17 [1980], 41–47) and M. Witzel (in *The Indo-Aryans in Ancient South Asia* [1995], esp. 333-37), and in the past, and I will therefore limit my comments. See the publ. intro. for structural and contextual disc. I am certain that many puns, wordplays, and snide asides are completely unrecoverable today and respectfully suggest that we put our energies into interpretinparts of the RV where we have a chance of success.

VII.18.1: Pāda c contains two parallel nominal clauses. Both should be in the causal domain of the *hí*, but it is located only in the 2nd of the two. We might have expected **t^{u}vé hí gā̆vaḥ sudúghās tvé áśvāḥ*, which would have been just as good metrically.

On the pun in d see publ. intro. and comm. ad vs. 4.

VII.18.2: As I interpr. it, the first hemistich presents us with a causal *hí* clause followed by an imperatival non-sequitur. What is immediately striking is that it is emphasized that Indra is dwelling in peace and domestic harmony -- not always the first picture of Indra we conjure up -- in a hymn that is about to become very very martial. In the imperatival clause of b, he is also identified as a wise *kaví*, again not a militant role for Indra. Perhaps the connection between the causal *hí* clause and the imperatival ones that follow is that Indra has the leisure to pay due attention to our hymns and reward our poetic offerings (which, as a *kaví*, he has the connoisseurship to appreciate) with aid and material goods.

The interpr. just given assumes that *áva* opening b and *piśā́* opening c are both imperatives. Both of these identifications have been questioned. Some (e.g., Lub) take *áva* as the preverb (Gr by implication, since he does not list it under √*av*), but both Ge

and Old (the latter after some hesitation) interpr. it as an impv. to √*av* 'help'. As for *piśā́*, Gr takes it as the instr. of a root noun, but most subsequent interpr. as the impv. to an otherwise unattested them. aor. to √*piś* 'adorn, ornament' (see, e.g., Old, Ge, Schindler [Rt. Noun], Lub). Our form could well be a thematic substitute for a form of the root aor., found once in the part. *piśānáⁿ*, since the expected root aor. impv. should be the quite opaque **pīḍhí*.

As indicated ad I.71.10, I do not have an independent view about the morphology of *vidúṣ*, which occurs in the same phrase in both passages (*abhí vidúṣ kavíḥ sán*). I do think that it is a nom. sg. (with Old), not a haplologized acc. pl. as Ge takes it (see his n. 10b ad I.71.10). (Debrunner [AiG II.2.471] seems weakly to assign it to a *-u*-stem [but possibly to *-uṣ-* instead] and interpr. as a nom. sg., while Wackernagel [AiG III.300, which publication of course long predates II.2] accepts Ge's acc. pl.) To me the form looks as if it is a truncated form of the weak form of the pf. part. *vidvā́ṃs-*, though it could of course belong to a *u*-stem *vidú-* instead -- but whether it is archaic or innovative I wouldn't venture to say. Many others have chosen to do so.

However, it is tempting to compare it with OAves. *vīduš* (Y. 28.4, 45.8), which Insler (124–25 ad Y. 28.4) interprets as the nom./acc. sg. of the pf. part. used adverbially, while Humbach (1991: II.22) takes it as a nom. sg. meaning 'witness' without pronouncing further on the morphological analysis beyond that it's "etymologically related" to the pf. part., and Kellens-Pirart (1990: 306) instead suggest it is cognate with Vedic *vidhú-*. Insler says explicitly that "Rigvedic *vidús* (2x) requires a different explanation," without specifying what it is. Kü for his part (39) suggests that both Vedic *vidúṣ* and the Avestan forms (including others like OA *vāunuš*) aren't directly connected to the pf. part. but are redupl. *u*-stem adj. like *jigyú-*. However, at least a secondary association with the perfect is needed for *vīduš* / *vidúṣ* to account for the *de*-reduplication they would exhibit, which matches the pf. stem.

It is also curious that in neither passage is the pres. part. *sán* concessive, though that is the usual function of the nom. forms of this participle. However, here the *sán* is by my interpr. in tmesis with *abhí*, which opens the repeated phrase, in the sense 'be preeminent' (so also Ge), even though participles in tmesis are rare – or perhaps less rare than is generally thought.

The apparent close sandhi with following *kavíḥ* that *vidúṣ* exhibits seems to me not to support the haplology explanation, though the sandhi issue is complex. Mark Hale (in "Preliminaries to the Study of the Relationship between Syntax and Sandhi in Rigvedic Sanskrit" [MSS 51, 1990], as well as the unpubl. *Wackernagel's Law: Phonology and Syntax in the Rigveda* [1995], 33–36) insightfully discusses the general problem of irregular sandhi of *-s* before *k-*. The great majority of the examples occur before forms of √*kṛ*, and Hale plausibly accounts for this phenomenon by pointing out that *kṛ* has an *s*-mobile doublet √*skṛ* and that the unusual *-s* sandhi outcomes can result from the doubled *-s s-* that would be underlying. The single example of such a result before the PN *káṇva-* can also be so explained, since we have a synchronic doublet *-skaṇva*. However, Hale's invocation of the *s*-mobile explanation for the exx. before *kaví-* is not supported by internal evidence for a **skaví-* or by solid evidence of *s*-mobile cognates outside of Indic, and I therefore think the *kaví-* examples require a different explanation -- though I don't know what that is. We should first note that they form a more limited set than Hale's presentation (1995: 36 n. 28) makes clear. The two *vidúṣ*

kavíḥ passages are identical, and *paśuṣ kavíḥ* occurs in our same hymn (8d) and is most likely responsive to the earlier example; *vásuṣ kavíḥ* (I.79.5) is nearby *vidúṣ kavíḥ* in I.71.10 (though admittedly not attributed to the same poet) and could be based upon it. *brahmaṇas kave* (VI.16.30) is in a voc. phrase where close sandhi effects are at home; cf. the very similar *brahmaṇas pate* (I.18.3). Of Hale's collection, this leaves V.59.4 *kás kā̆vyā* [*sic*, not Hale's *kāvyāḥ*] and *ṛtás kavíḥ* (VIII.60.5). The latter is problematic for a different reason: it contains one of only two exx. of a masc. *ṛtá-*; the other is in the same phrase (IX.62.30) but with standard sandhi *ṛtáḥ kavíḥ*. In fact most occurrences of *kaví-* (*kā̆vya-*, etc.) preceded by *-s* do show the standard visarga (e.g., among the many, I.76.5 *kavíbhiḥ kavíḥ*). I don't know what to make of all this. I am inclined to think that the irregular sandhi originated in the morphologically problematic phrases *vidúṣ kavíḥ* and *ṛtás kavíḥ* and is a dark reflection of their troubled morphology. It then had a very limited spread. But since I don't understand what the morphology is or how this could affect the sandhi, this is not much of a theory! In any case, the poet of this hymn seems to showcase this sandhi anomaly, by not only including the two *-uṣ ka-* examples (2b, 8d), but also adding the correct *āśúś canéd* (9b) and close sandhi *rāradhuṣ ṭe* (18a); cf. also *suṣupuḥ ṣáṭ* (14b).

The cows and horses attributed to Indra in 1c reappear here in c as his ornamental gifts to us.

VII.18.4: The desid. part. *dúdukṣan* is mildly notable because 1) it does not exhibit reverse-Grassmann (**dúdhukṣan*) unlike the *s*-aor. *ádhukṣat* (also, however, *adukṣat*); 2) it is a real part., not the *u*-adj. often substituting for the part. in the desid. (**dudukṣú-).*

Because of the overt switch to the 1st ps. in c, I take the pf. *sasṛje* in b as 1st ps. (flg. JPB p.c.), with *vásiṣṭhaḥ* doubling the underlying subject. The pf. form is of course ambig. between 1st and 3rd.

As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. exhibits a kind of ring comp. via an anagrammatic pun: 1c *vásu ... vániṣṭhaḥ* "best gainer of goods" is compressed into the name of the poet *vásiṣṭhaḥ* (*vás[u]... [ván]iṣṭhaḥ*). This brings the first section of the hymn to a close; the battle scene erupts abruptly in the next vs.

VII.18.5: My tr. of the 2nd hemistich follows Old's, contra Ge.

VII.18.6: The first hemistich contains two ironic reversals, based on what are presumably personal names or plays on them. In the first pāda *yákṣu-*, perhaps a pun on Yadu, can be rendered as 'sacrificer' (so Schmidt, from whom I adapted the tr.), and he himself becomes the sacrifice, or a part of it: *puroḷā̆ḥ* 'offering cake'.

The presumed underlying form of this nom. sg., *puroḷā̆s* (also found in III.28.2), is unexpected: to the stem *puroḷā̆ś-* we might rather find **puroḷā̆ṭ*. See Scar (221) with lit. It is worth pointing out in this case, as well as with equally unexpected *sadhamā̆s* in the next vs., that the final of both forms matches that of *sudā̆s*, our hero the king Sudās, and so there may have been some adjustment in that direction, esp. in a hymn given to phonological manipulation. Unfortunately this doesn't explain the occurrence in III.28.2.

In b the name of the ill-fated enemy *mátsyāsaḥ* is also the common noun 'fish', and this word should be read in both the simile and the frame. Following Old (and Ge, who adopted Old's suggestion), I take *ápīva* as containing not only the particle *ápi* 'also'

but also a putative loc. sg. to *áp-* 'water'. Although there are vanishingly few singular forms to this stem in the RV, they do exist (with more in Avestan). The loc. should also be accented **apí*, but in puns accentual fluidity is common. The "fish" pun cries out for the "water" interpr., though Schmidt seems to reject it. He then introduces a pun that isn't supported by the text, rendering *rāyé ... níśitāḥ* as "hooked on wealth (like fishes on bait)." Though this is appealingly cute, it is hard to push *ní √śā* 'whet (down)' to 'hook', and dat. *rāyé* is also hard to fit into that idiom. Moreover, (*ní*) *√śā* is a sort of signature verb in this hymn; cf. 2d, 11c, 24d, and in particular the positive 2d *śiśīhi rāyé asmā́n* "whet us for wealth" appears to be the polarized counterpart of our negative *rāyé ... níśitāḥ*. I wish I could find a clever expression to capture the image, but so far I have been unable to.

There is a diversity of opinion on what is happening in d as expressed by the verb *atarat*. Ge thinks that friend is helping friend, though this requires *√tṝ* to mean 'help', not a usage I'm aware of; Old that the enemy ranks were divided into two parts, both fleeing but one faster than, and therefore overtaking (*√tṝ*), the other. This seems also to be Schmidt's view, though his "crossed (overcame)" shows a non-idiomatic usage of English 'overcame' (meaning 'overtook'?). The Old/Schmidt view seems possible, but I interpr. it in the light of VIII.1.4, where I take *tartūryante* to refer to the crisscrossing movements of people in opposite sides of a conflict. I suggest that here *sákhā sákhāyam* refers to former comrades who are now fighting on opposite sides and crossing each other's path in the battle line: the shifting alliances of the participants in the Ten Kings battle are notorious and much discussed (see esp. Witzel's treatment cited above).

VII.18.7: Ge (fld. by Gotō, 1st Kl., 222) takes *bhananta* as reflexive ("... nannten sich") with *śivā́saḥ* as pred. nom., but the responsive pairing of act. 3rd pl. pres. *bhananti* and mid. 3rd pl. injunc. *bhananta* in adjacent vss. in the same metrical position in IV.18.6–7 (see comm. ad loc.) marks *bhananta* as a text-book case of *-anta* replacement, as disc. in my 1979 article. Flg. Schmidt, I take cd as the direct speech implied by *bhananta*. Old also rejects the Ge interpr.

The *l*'s of the names *bhalānás-* and *álina-* and the unmotivated retroflex *-ṣ-* in *viṣāṇín-* suggest peoples outside of the Ārya mainstream, although of course they could also show the kinds of deliberate phonological deformation found elsewhere in the hymn. It's possible that *bhalānás-* reflects a form of *√bhṛ*, hence my 'raiders'. It is not clear whether *śivā́saḥ* should be interpr. as the usual adj. ('kindly') or as the name of another group of fighters. The publ. tr. reflects the former (flg. Schmidt), but I am now inclined to consider the latter more likely, primarily because it's not phonologically outlandish. In this case I'd tr. "The Pakthas and the Bhalānases spoke out, and the Alinas and the Viṣāṇins -- (all) 'kindly' --" This would be a sarcastic aside about the martial forces ranged against us.

If we accept the Schmidt/Witzel distribution of the allegiances of the various named forces, those named in ab are complaining about the defection of the *sadhamā́d-* who led them to the battle but has now gone over to the Tṛtsu (/Sudās) side and has turned to attack the *nṝ́n* ('superior men'), by which they mean themselves. The *sadhamā́d-* is most likely Indra, and so losing him as an ally would be a serious blow.

On the unexpected form *sadhamā́s*, if the nom. sg. to *sadhamā́d-*, see Scar (381) with lit. I think it unlikely that it's an acc. pl., a possibility Old considers by assigning it

to a diff. root. As noted above (vs. 6) with regard to *puroḷā̆s*, the rhyme with king Sudās may have played a part.

Ge's interpr. of the syntax of cd is impossible: it contains an embedded *main* clause! His rel. cl. consists of *ā́ yó 'nayat ... yudhā́ nṝ́n* "... der seine Mannen unter Kampf heranführte" -- the beginning of c and the end of d. While his main clause is the end of c and the beginning of d, ... *sadhamā́ ā́ryasya, gavyā́ tṛ́tsubhyo ajagan* ... "Der Mahlgenossen des Ariers ... ist aus Verlangen nach Kühen den Tṛtsu's (zu Hilfe) gekommen." My tr. follows Old's, which is slightly adjusted by Schmidt.

VII.18.8: Both this vs. and the following one concern the Paruṣṇī river, known from elsewhere in the RV and later. In the 2nd pāda the VP *ví jagṛbhre páruṣṇīm*, lit. "they grasped apart the P.," is generally taken to mean 'divert' the course of the river (so already Gr, also Ge; Schmidt slightly differently 'divided'). The lexeme *ví √grabh* occurs only once in the RV, but this seems a reasonable interpr. -- though I'm not exactly sure how this feat of engineering would have been accomplished. Perhaps so many bodies accumulated in the river that it either had to flow around them (hence Schmidt's 'divided') or switch its course altogether. The use of the middle *jagṛbhre* might support the former interpr.: they themselves [i.e., their own bodies] parted the river. One is reminded of Iliad 21.205ff., where Achilles drives his enemies towards the Scamander river, which berates and then fights with Achilles for filling the river with corpses.

In the preceding pāda *áditi-* is also sometimes taken to be a river (Ge n. 8a, Schmidt), but this seems much less likely to me. Aditi is, of course, a well-known goddess, and her miscarriage is also a well-known mythological incident, in the narrative of the sequence of her twin births ending with one miscarriage and one live baby -- found already in the RV (see the clear passage X.72.8). It therefore seems wiser not to make her capriciously into a landscape feature, but to start with the mythological facts that might match the VP *áditiṃ srevayántaḥ* "making Aditi abort." Now, as is often related in middle Vedic texts, when the eighth embryo of Aditi aborts, it becomes first the discarded Mārtāṇḍa ('stemming from a dead egg'), but is then fixed up and becomes Vivasvant, a name for the sun (see my Hyenas, pp. 204-8; this identification is already implicit in the RV, *pace* Hoffmann). I wonder if "causing Aditi to abort" refers to her aborted son, the sun, and in this case, by metaphor, to an eclipse of the sun -- or at least something that could pass for one. If the dust of a pitched battle got thick enough it could rise to blot out the sun's rays temporarily. Rising dust is often elsewhere a sign of intense fighting in the RV, and flights of arrows so thick that they obscure the sun are a feature of battles in the epics (e.g., MBh IV.53.26, 31). This loss of light could render the combatants *acetás-* (b), lit. 'without perception' in b.

The *durādhyàḥ* 'ill-intentioned ones' are probably the same faction as those referred to, probably sarcastically, as 'kindly' (*śivā́saḥ* in the previous vs., 7b).

Apparently alone of all tr. and comm., I do not have an opinion about who the personnel are in cd. See the various suggestions, esp. those of Schmidt and Witzel.

As for *cā́yamāna-*, I assign it the intrans./pass. sense 'being perceived as, appearing as', rather than, e.g., Schmidt's "receiving due respect." Gotō's interpr. (1st Kl. 137) is closer to mine, but he considers it reflexive: "sich als ... betrachtend, sich für ... haltend." He does not tr. this passage (or the other participial form in X.94.14). Whoever the subject is -- Schmidt and Witzel think it's Vasiṣṭha, the purohita of Turvaśa, but I

remain agnostic -- in my view this kavi has been felled, at least temporarily, and therefore gives the impression of being a *paśú-*, in this case a sacrificial, or already sacrificed, animal. Note the main verb *aśayat* (√*śi* 'lie'), which is the signature verb describing the slain Vṛtra in I.32. Note *paśúṣ kavíḥ*, which shows the same sandhi before *kavíḥ* as *vidúṣ kavíḥ* in 2b; see disc. there.

VII.18.9: With Ge (etc.), I take *ná* in pāda a as a simile marker, not a negative; the simile and frame participate in a pun on (-)*ártha-*. What they reached was a *ni-àrtha-* 'failed goal' (see, e.g., VI.27.6, X.107.8), which is *like*, but tragically *not*, their real goal. Brent Vine (IIJ 20 [1978]: 179) suggests that *ná* represents both the simile marker and the negative, exploiting the fact that they both can appear in this metrical position in Trimeter vs. Curiously he doesn't supply a tr., but if we adopt his suggestion, perhaps "They came to the Paruṣṇī, to a failed end as if to their (real) goal: they did not reach their goal."

In b note *āśúś (canéd)*, which echoes *paśúṣ* (*kavíḥ)* in the previous vs. (8d) also pāda-initial. Here the sandhi is of course standard.

The adj. *sutúka-* occurs 7x in the RV; acdg. to EWA (s.v.) its meaning and etymology are unknown, though it is generally translated in the 'quick, swift' realm (like so many other unclear RVic adj.), e.g., Gr "rasch dahin eilend," Ge (this passage) "spornstreichs fliehend." On the basis of X.42.5, where it appears parallel to *svá ṣṭra-* 'easily goaded', I suggest that it means 'easily thrust/thrusting' and is ultimately derived from √*tuj* 'thrust'. Under this analysis, of course, the voiceless *-k-* is a problem. Easiest would be to extract it from the unattested nom. sg. of the reasonably well-attested root noun *túj-*, which should be **túk*, supported by pre-C forms like **tugbhís*, **tukṣú.* This is essentially a variant of Re's (EVP XII.108) suggestion that it belongs to a root √*tuc*, a doublet of √*tuj*, but it avoids the awkwardness of positing this extra root to explain one stem. In fact, Re suggests in passing that it could start from an athematic nom. sg. **sutuk* (he gives no accent), but he prefers the √*tuc* hypothesis.

In view of the disorderly rout of these forces described in the next vs., presumably due to the collapse of their alliance, I now wonder if *amítrān* refers not to their non-alliance with us (as in the publ. tr.), but to the lack or loss of unity among themselves.

In d Ge takes *mā̆nuṣe* as a place name ("in Mānuṣa"), on the basis of JB III.244, which identifies it as the place of the Ten Kings battle. But, as Ge admits (n. 9d), the JB rendering could easily result from a misunderstanding of our passage. Old suggests (not very enthusiastically) that it refers to (all) the enemies "in der Menschenwelt." Schmidt's interpr. is somewhat puzzling, putting it in an (unexpressed) simile contrasting the "castrates" of *vádhri-vāc-* to a (presumably virile) man expressed by *mā̆nuṣa-*: "who were talking like castrates in the world of a man." I think rather that it refers to Manu's race or people: all other loc. singulars of this stem modify *jáne* (save for I.12.8.7, where it qualifies the semantically close *vṛjáne*). I take the expression as concessive "(though) in Manu's (race)": the point is that the opponents belong to the larger Ārya community though they are fighting against us. They therefore in principle share the same sacrificial practices, including ritual speech, but their ritual speech is ineffective (or so we hope), like that of a castrate. The extensive ritual references in the account of the battle only work under these conditions.

The cmpd. *vádhri-vāc-* 'possessing gelded/castrated speech' provides another parallel to the famous Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, whose vs. 7 likens Vṛtra to a *vádhri-* wishing to become a bull.

VII.18.10: The vs. begins *īyúr gā̆vo ná*, very similar to the opening of the preceding vs. 9 *īyúr árthaṃ ná*. The simile of the cows without a cowherd (*gā̆vo ná ... ágopāḥ*) presumably depicts the disordered flight of the troops that have lost their leader.

I have now considerably changed my interpr. of the 2nd pāda. In the publ. tr. I take *citā̆saḥ* as belonging to √*ci* 'perceive', meaning 'perceived as, seeming', rather than to √*ci* 'gather', the usual interpr. I now think the standard root assignment is correct, but that it means not 'assembled, gathered' (so Ge, Schmidt) but 'piled up'. In other words, the panic-stricken troops, running pell-mell without an overall leader, hit an obstacle and pile up on top of each other in a heap of bodies.

The object they run into (*abhí*) is the opposing side, which is acting as allied forces under a properly concluded agreement: *yathākṛtám ... mitrám*. The standard view of this phrase is that it describes the situation of the subjects, the fleeing fighters, construed with *citā̆saḥ* and therefore referring to an accidental or on-the-spot alliance; so Ge "zu zufällig geschlossener Freundschaft geschart," Schmidt "... assembled for an alliance made on the spur of the moment." But as Old points out, *mitrám* √*kṛ* is the standard phrase for concluding an alliance in the normal fashion, not for one made under pressure or by chance. It therefore better describes the well-organized forces the subjects are confronting, and as I said in the comm. to the preceding vs., the adj. *amítrān* there may well describe the lack of alliance among these fighters going to defeat, here contrasted with our side, which is acting in concert under a functioning alliance. I would therefore alter the publ. tr. to "They went ... piled up against an alliance properly concluded [=their enemies]."

In c the pl. *pṛ́śnigāvaḥ* may well be the name of a clan, as Old suggests; the PN interpr. is followed also by Ge and Schmidt as well as the publ. tr. But it of course has a straightforward bahuvrīhi interpr. ('having dappled cows') and, more to the point, echoes the cow simile of the first hemistich, with *-gāvaḥ* in the same metrical position as *gā̆vaḥ* in a. That the first member *pṛ́śni-* is immediately repeated in the cmpd *pṛ́śni-nipreṣitāsaḥ* calls further attention to the cmpd analysis. As for the 2nd cmpd., I am drawn to Ge's suggestion (n. 10) that *pṛ́śni-* is a pun on the river name Paruṣṇī.

In d *ránti-* is problematic. In its other occurrence, IX.102.5, it clearly means 'joys'. But that makes no sense here. Ge refuses to tr.; Old tentatively suggests that the word has developed into a "sakral-poetisch" term for cow, presumably starting from 'joy'. Schmidt tr. "supply lines" (< 'refreshment' < 'enjoyment'), but this seems a semantic chain too tenuous, esp. since the logistics and support for the battle do not otherwise figure in this hymn (unless in 15cd). I take it as 'battler', assuming that it shows the same semantic bifurcation as *ráṇa-*, both 'joy' and 'battle'.

The phrase *śruṣṭím cakruḥ* opening d, "they followed orders," forms a ring with the same phrase in 6c. This is, at first, puzzling, since vss. 6-10 do not appear to form a discrete section. However, on 2nd glance we can note that these five vss. mark out the most intense and name-heavy portion of the battle. Starting with the next vs. Indra takes over the fighting, and the hymn turns to the celebration of Indra and his victorious feats;

vs. 5, preceding this section, also attributes the whole victory to Indra. The god is absent from 6–10, with the combatants on their own and engaged in pitched battle.

VII.18.11: The king who is the subj. of ab may be Sudās (so Ge, flg. Sāy.) or Indra, who appears by name in d, or Sudās identified with Indra. Given the ring-compositional structure discussed ad vs. 10, I favor either Indra or Sudās=Indra.

The relationship between the simile of c and the first hemistich is intricate and partly unclear. The first hemistich portrays the destruction by a king of a large force belonging to an otherwise unknown pair (the Vaikarṇas), using the aniṭ root *ní √stṛ* (root aor. *ny ástaḥ*) 'strew down' found also in other hostile encounters (e.g., II.11.20). Pāda c by contrast sketches a *ritual* incident in a simile, but the simile is slightly "off" for several reasons. For one thing, the predicate phrase *sádman ... barhíḥ* "the ritual grass on the seat" suggests that the verb to govern it should also be 'strew down', though in its seṭ form (cf., e.g., VII.43.2 *stṛṇītá barhíḥ*). The actual verb of the simile, *ní śiśāti* 'whets down', is far less appropriate to its object, and we must assume a metaphorical use of this verb in the simile -- a piling of figurative language on figurative language, made all the more peculiar by the fact that the verb of b would be better suited to the simile of c and vice versa. (Recall also that [*ní*] *√śā* is the signature verb of this hymn; see comm. ad vs. 6.) It is almost as if the simile had been turned inside out or the two clauses had swapped out verbs. Also disturbing the simile is the fact that the subject of the clause, which, as agent of a verb governing ritual grass, should be a priest or ritual functionary, is identified as *dasmá-* 'wondrous, wonder-worker', an adj. otherwise only applied to gods, esp. Indra (e.g., in nearby VII.22.8). So it too seems more at home in the main clause of ab than in the simile of c, an association made stronger by the fact that *dasmá-* several times occurs with *rā́jan-* in a simile (IX.82.1 *rā́jeva dasmáḥ*, X.43.2 *rā́jeva dasma*) and *rā́jā* is the subject of ab. The interconnections become even more tangled when we consider the 2nd of those just-cited similes: X.43.2 *rā́jeva dasma ní ṣadó 'dhi barhíṣi* "Like a king, wondrous one [=Indra], sit down upon the ritual grass," which contains the grass and the root *√sad* 'sit', but there realized as a verb rather than as the loc. nominal *sádman*. And another problem with the whole construction is the fact that the rel. prn. *yáḥ* of the elaborate rel. clause of ab does not have a correspondent in the main clause of c, since the main clause consists only of a simile, whose agent should not be coreferential with the king of ab. Only in the apparently independent clause in d do we get an appropriate referent (*índraḥ*).

VII.18.12: The "famous old" Kavaṣa, with his non-Indo-Aryan name, reminds us of Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, named by the Anukramaṇī as the poet of X.30–34. See comm. ad loc.

Old suggests that we read *ánuṃ*, not *ánu*, in b -- thus a PN, not a preverb -- given the co-occurrence of the PNs *ánu-* and *druhyú-* elsewhere, incl. 14a, I.108.8, etc., as well as the vṛddhi deriv. *ā́nava-* in the next vs. (13c). I have adopted this suggestion; note that it does not affect the meter, as the next word (*druhyúm*) begins with a cluster.

The relationship between the two hemistichs is loose and unclear. On the basis of vs. 11, esp. 11d, and the epithet *vájrabāhuḥ* in 12b, we are entitled to assume that the 1st hemistich has Indra as subject and is couched in the 3rd ps. But the 2nd hemistich refers twice to 'you' (d *tvāyántaḥ ... tvā*), manifestly referring also to Indra, and the verb in the first hemistich, *ní vṛṇak* is ambig. between 2nd and 3rd -- a typical modulation point. I

would keep the publ. tr. ("he wrenched down"), but with the awareness that the transition to 2nd ps. reference may already be underway.

The 2nd hemistich has Indra's followers as subj., with d containing a rel. cl. with nom. pl. *yé*. How to construe it is the question. Although there is no overt (or indeed covert) representation of this plural group in the first hemistich, Ge takes the whole of cd as an improper relative, tr. "während deine Anhänger, Freundschaft für Freundschaft erwählend, dir zujubelten." This not only reinterprets *yé* as a general subordinator rather than a rel. prn., but it also has this subordinator placed very deeply in its supposed clause. I prefer to take pāda c as containing a predicated root aor. part. *vṛṇānāḥ* ["(They were) choosing your partnership ... (those) who ..."], which allows the rel. cl. of d to have a more standard configuration, referring to the pl. subj. of the nominal clause of c.

VII.18.13: With nom. *índraḥ* this vs. seems to return to 3rd ps. reference—though it's worth noting that both verbs of which *índraḥ* is subject are ambig. between 2nd and 3rd ps. (*dardaḥ* b, *bhāk* c), and so an appositive 2nd ps. reading "(you,) Indra, ..." is barely possible.

The adv. *sadyáḥ* 'in an instant, all at once' seems to clash semantically with its verb *dardaḥ*, given the usual function of the "intensive" as a frequentative. It would probably be better here to render *sadyáḥ* with Ge as 'in a single day', indicating that Indra could destroy multiple fortifications in a limited time span.

The 1st pl. *jeṣma* is generally interpr. these days as a precative: see esp. Hoffmann (Injunk. 254), Narten (Sig.Aor. 119–20), and Ge's tr. "Möchten wir ... besiegen." Certainly the other two occurrences of this form in the RV (VI.45.12, X.156.1) have clear modal value. But in this context, in a long narrative set in the past, though carried in part by injunctive forms like *dardaḥ* and *bhāg* in this vs., a modal would be jarring and would interrupt the narrative by suddenly expressing a hope for the future. I therefore follow, for this form here, the older interpr. of *jeṣma* (see reff. in Hoffmann and Narten) as an irregular injunc. (for expected **jaiṣma*; cf. *ajaiṣma* VIII.47.18=X.164.5).

VII.18.14: Pāda b is notable for its alliteration, making full use of all three sibilants: *ṣaṣṭíḥ śatā́ suṣupuḥ ṣáṭ sahásrā*. The sums are tautological, as Old points out: sixty hundred and six thousand amounting to the same number. Both 'sixty' (*ṣaṣṭíḥ*) and 'six' (*ṣáṭ*) reappear in the next pāda. The standard interpr. is that these sixty-six in c are just an addition to the six thousand enumerated in the previous pāda. However, Old suggests that they constitute the opposite side, the 'heroes' (*vīrā́saḥ*) 'seeking favor' (*duvoyú*), who are fighting against those enumerated in pāda b. This interpr. has the merit of not requiring those two words to be used ironically (on the latter, see Ge's n. 14c), and it also makes the victory that much more impressive, that this small number, with Indra on their side, could defeat many multiples of themselves. The same point is made more forcefully in vs. 17. The same balance between the good guys and the bad guys, as it were, is found in the next vs., 15, where the Tṛtsus of ab are Indra's allies, but their opposite numbers are found in cd.

VII.18.15: As just noted, the vs. is divided into two, with the Tṛtsus of Indra's party in full flood in ab (on the attack, one presumes) and their enemies abandoning their possessions under the pressure of this attack. These enemies are identified as

durmitrā́saḥ; as with *amítra-* of 9c, this descriptor seems meant to signal the fraying or loss of the alliances that bound them and perhaps also to identify these alliances as badly formed in the first place. The other example of this form as a full adj. is nearby in VII.28.4; *durmitrá-* in X.105.11 is used as a PN in a quite possibly independent play on the PN *sumitrá-*.

The first hemistich is straightforward; the second has its puzzles, starting with the form *prakalavíd* (or, theoretically possible, *-vín*) in c. See, first, Old, who rejects several previous suggestions and hesitantly follows what is found in Gr, as does Ge (as do I): a root-noun cmpd. with √*vid* 'know', a 1st member related to *kalā́-* 'small part' (VIII.37.17), used adverbially (Gr 'die kleinsten Theile berechnend' → 'kleinlich'). Scar (486) discusses in somewhat more detail but reaches the same hesitant conclusions. The universal uncertainty has much to do with the difficulty of fitting this sense into context. I take the cmpd as implicitly contrasted with *víśvāni* in d. By my interpr., the enemy forces measure their supplies precisely and parsimoniously, "knowing every little piece" (Old "mit Kunde jedes kleinsten Teils") -- hence my idiomatic "with a miser's eye." But when confronted by the Tṛtsus' attack, they profligately abandon everything and flee.

Kü (608) interpr. *mímānāḥ* as reflexive/intrans. 'die kleinlich sich messen', though with ?, but, despite the middle voice, the other forms to this stem are consistently transitive.

VII.18.16: Pāda c is notable for the alliterative and etymological figure *manyúm manyumyò mimāya*, with the middle term *manyu-mī́-* containing the noun to its left (*manyú-*) and the root noun of the verb to its right (√*mī*). Though *mimāya* phonologically echoes *mímānā(ḥ)* at the end of 15c, they of course belong to different roots.

Pāda d contains a rare and curious idiom PATH √*bhaj*; cf. VII.39.1 *bhejā́te ... pánthām*, possibly IX.102.2 *ábhakta ... padám*, which I take (with Ge) to mean "set out on the road," similar to, though with a different idiomatic verb, Engl. "hit the road." The expression is complicated here by the question of how to construe *pathó vartaním*. Is *patháḥ* acc. pl. and direct object of *bhejé*, with *vartaním* the obj. of *pátyamāṇaḥ*? Such is the interpr. of Ge and Kü (334, 368) -- Ge with an idiomatic interpr. of *bhejé patháḥ*, Kü with a more literal one. However, I think it more likely that *patháḥ* is a gen. sg. dependent on *vartaním* on the basis of IV.45.3 *ā́ vartaním mádhunā jinvathas patháḥ* "You quicken the course of the path with honey."

VII.18.17: If my interpr. of 14c is correct in taking the small number (66) as the allies of Indra facing off a much larger force, this vs. continues the same theme, first as a straightforward statement (a), then with two different metaphors (b, c): Indra easily prevailed despite the relative insufficiency of his tools.

In b, if the standard interpr. of *pétva-* as 'castrated ram, wether' is correct (see, e.g., EWA s.v.), the pairing of target and instrument is esp. striking: a fierce but female wild animal, the lioness, and a castrated but (originally) male domestic one, a wether, with opposition of both animal-type (wild/domestic) and gender, with the latter complicated by the emasculation of the male representative.

The same thematic and syntactic template prevails in c, but neither the target nor the tool is clearly identified. *veśī́-* (in the instr. *veśyā́*) is a hapax; the standard tr. 'needle' derives from Sāy., but in fact this doesn't make much sense. *sraktí-* has better

representation: it's found in the cmpd. *náva-srakti-* '9-srakti-ed' (also VS *cátuaḥ-srakti*) and has an Aves. cognate *sraxti-*, *θraxti-* 'edge, side'. EWA connects it with *sṛká-* 'fang'. To figure out what must be going on, we need to turn to the verb, *áva ... (a)vṛścat*. The lexeme *áva √vraśc* 'hew down' is found only once elsewhere, in I.51.7, where it is used figuratively. But *ní √vraśc*, with the semantically similar preverb *ní*, twice appears with a concrete image: hewing down trees with an axe. See esp. I.130.4fg *táṣṭeva vṛkṣám vaníno ní vṛścasi, paraśvéva ní vṛścasi* "like a carpenter a tree from the wooden one [=forest], you cut down (the serpent) -- as if with an ax you cut (him) down" (sim. VI.8.5). The acc. pl. *sraktī́ḥ* in our passage matches the role of the trees in the passages just cited. I suggest that as 'edge' it refers to the edges of a tree trunk or to something that is, as it were, pure 'edge' -- a pole. As the instr., *veśyā̀* should correspond to the axe. A needle doesn't work, but perhaps a pin -- a small, sharp-pointed object that would ordinarily not have much success in felling tall poles. I agree with Old that the expression is probably proverbial.

The ending of d, *bhójanā sudā́se*, is identical to the end of the last vs., 15d, preceded by *víśvāni* (15d) and *víśvā* (16d) respectively. The *bhójanā* that the enemies abandoned in 15 are here given to Sudās by Indra.

VII.18.18: I follow Ge in taking this vs. as direct speech.

Although Ge's tr. of *rándhi-* in b as "schwache Stelle" is appealing, I preferred to register the etymological figure between the verb of pāda a, *rāradhuḥ*, and this noun.

Note the close sandhi *rāradhuṣ ṭe*, which reminds us of *vidúṣ kavíḥ* (2a) and *paśúṣ kavíḥ* (8d), as well as correct *āsúś canéd* (9b).

The rel. prn. *yáḥ* is too deep in its clause, following both direct objects of *kṛṇóti*: *mártān ... stuvatáḥ* and *énaḥ*. I have no explan. for this violation.

VII.18.19: This is the last vs. with direct reference to the battle. The following two (20–21) provide general praise of Indra's aid and generosity, leading up to the 4-vs. dānastuti.

Ge (n. 19d) insightfully suggests that pāda d is an ironic reflection on the horses that died in the encounter.

VII.18.20: Ge takes *pū́rvāḥ ... nū́tnāḥ* as qualifying *sumatáyaḥ ... rā́yaḥ*: "Deine Gnaden und deine Reichtümer, die frühere und die neuesten, sind nicht vollständig aufzuzählen, so wenig wie die Morgenröten." I prefer to take them with *uṣásaḥ*, for several reasons. First, the word order, with *uṣásaḥ* nestled between the two temporal adjectives, favors this interpr. Also my interpr. allows the *ná ... ná ... ná* sequence to be entirely negative, rather than requiring the last to be a simile marker. Moreover, the contrast between former and current dawn(s) is a standard trope in the RV, with *pū́rva-* qualifying dawn in a number of passages. And finally morphology is against it: Ge would need to explain why a fem. nom. pl. *pū́rvāḥ*, rather than the masc. *pū́rve*, was used to modify a mixed feminine (*sumatáyaḥ*) and masculine (*rā́yaḥ*) NP; ordinarily the default would be masc., esp. in this case where the masc. is closer to the adjectives. (He could of course invoke the supposed occasional use of *rayí-*, *rāy-* as feminine, but these exx. are vanishingly rare, if they exist at all.) I take the whole dawn phrase as an acc. of extent of time. It would be possible to assign the temporal adjectives to *uṣásaḥ* but interpr. that phrase as a simile in the nom., as Scar (167) does: "Nicht sind deine Gnaden, nicht deine Gaben zu überschauen, genausowenig wie die vergangenen und jetzigen Morgenröten." I still

prefer mine, since Scar's interpr. again requires the third *ná* to be a simile marker, even though it does avoid the problems raised by taking the temporal adjectives with the NP in pāda a.

In c *dévaka-* is a lovely ex. of the use of the *-ka-* suffix both in a pejorative sense and as signal of a lower register. Edgerton's (-ka-suffix, 43) tr. is rather nice: "the wretched little fellow who thought himself a godling."

The form *mānyamāná-* is of course peculiar, though its source is clear: it is a vṛddhi deriv. of the middle part. *mányamāna-* 'think oneself to be ...' Although Ge takes it separately from *dévaka-* as two distinct pejorative epithets ("...den Götzen, den Dünkling"), I find it hard not to think that the participial usage is not still present and that *dévaka-* is the de facto predicate nominative. The vṛddhi is perhaps used to turn the typical subject of this participle into a category characterized by blind arrogance ("the type of blowhard who would think himself ...") -- well captured by Edgerton's tr.

The verb in d, *bhet* (√*bhid*), recalls the enemy Bheda targeted by Indra in vss. 18–19.

VII.18.21: The sense of the first pāda is disputed, primarily because it is unclear how to construe the abl. *gṛhā́t*. Old discusses at length without a definite decision; Ge has his own idiosyncratic view: that in this context, with the abl. *gṛhā́t*, *prá* √*mad* means 'to go on a pilgrimage' ("die ... von Hause fortgepilgert waren"), a bizarre interpr. (rejected by Old), which he connects to *abhí ... pramandúḥ* in VII.33.1, where his pilgrimage interpr. seems equally odd. The phraseology here needs to be considered in the context of similar expressions, not only VII.33.1, but also VIII.61.9 *sá prá mamandat tvāyā́* and vs. 12d in this hymn *tvāyánto yé ámadann ánu tvā* (and consider the immediately preceding pāda 12c *vṛṇānā́ átra sakhyā́ya sakhyám*, which resonantes with our c *ná te ... sakhyám mṛṣanta*). Because of their proximity in the same hymn, I think vs. 12 needs to be weighted more heavily than the other passages, despite the difference in preverb (*ánu* there versus *prá* here). That vs. states that the men devoted to Indra cheered him on -- in other words, Indra was the recipient of an overt expression of their devotion -- and in turn they acquired a partnership with him. I now think that *prá ... ámamaduḥ* in this vs. should also be transitive, with Indra as the object. Perhaps by haplology **tvā tvāyā́*. I would therefore alter the publ. tr. to "... who exhilarated (you) in devotion to you," with a different type of overt expression of devotion, here the soma. Pāda c then indicates that by doing so they did not neglect the responsibilities of their side of the partnership and (d) happy days ensue as a result. Interpreting *prá ... ámamaduḥ* here as transitive also has the merit of matching the use of *abhí ... pramandúḥ* in VII.33.1, where there is an overt object *mā*. The similar expression in VIII.61.9 is more equivocal; see disc. there.

This reappraisal of the verbal complex does not, however, solve the ablative problem. My proposed solution, already found in the publ. tr., is quite simple: the individuals named in pāda b (who include Vasiṣṭha) are relatives, "from the (same) house" -- a use of 'house' similar to that in expressions like "the House of Atreus." Under this interpr., there is no physical movement out of or location away from an actual dwelling. As this is the only abl. form of *gṛhá-* in the RV, it is difficult to know if such an idiomatic usage is possible, but given that the verb in its clause is not a verb of motion and cannot be made one without damage to its normal semantics, this seems like a reasonable alternative.

bhojá- ‘provider, benefactor’ is used of Indra elsewhere on a number of occasions (e.g., VI.23.9), but it is also used explicitly of a human *sūrí-* ‘patron’ in VIII.70.13, as well as being repeated densely in X.107.8–11, the hymn devoted to the dakṣiṇā and the *bhoja*-s who give it. So I suggest in our vs. that its appliication to Indra in c is an attempt to transfer the epithet to the *sūri*-s in d.

VII.18.22: The first two pādas begin the enumeration of the Paijavana’s *dā́na-* mentioned in c -- an enumeration continued in 23.

The simile in d, *hóteva sádma páry emi*, is one of the few clear references to the animal sacrifice in the RV, with this depicting the Paryagnikaraṇa; cf. IX.97.1, where the animals are explicit.

VII.18.23: On *smáddiṣṭi-*, see comm. ad III.45.5.

In ab I supply *vahanti* on the basis of d, with Ge.

VII.18.24: The *śrávas-* in pāda a echoes the one in 23d.

Ge, flg. Sāy., takes ab as separate clauses, supplying “(sich ausbreitet)” as the verb in pāda a. This is unnecessary: the hemistich can be a single clause, with the accent on *vibabhā́jā* in b conditioned by the rel. *yásya* in a. (Ge considers this possibility in n. 24ab.) Kü (333) also follows the single clause interpr.

Note the lengthened 3rd sg. pf. ending in *babhā́jā*, guaranteed (and required) by the cadence. On lengthening of the pf. endings see the brief remarks by Kü (42), though without any indication of the relative frequency; it is my impression that lengthening of the 1st/3rd sg. *-a* is quite rare in the RV, but I haven’t made a count.

The fame being distributed is presumably that of Sudās, though covertly assimiliated to Indra’s; note the explicit comparison of the praise he receives to Indra’s in the simile in c. The āmreḍita “every head” (*śīrṣṇé-śīrṣṇe*) must refer to every person, or rather every person eligible for fame (excluding women and non-elite males), in Sudās’s entourage: they all get a piece of the fame-pie that he acquired by himself. The geographical extravagance of “every head between the two wide world halves” -- that is, every eligible person on earth -- is presumably part of a totalizing claim about the outcome of the Ten Kings’ Battle, that the whole world was brought under Sudās’s sway.

The loud sound of rivers in flood is the point of the comparison in c. One of the words for ‘river’, *nadī́*, is folk etymologically (and probably etymologically; see EWA s.v.) connected with √*nad* ‘roar’, as in the explicit etymological statement in AV III.13.1 *yád adáḥ saṃprayatī́r áhāv ánadatā haté / tásmād ā́ nadyò nā́ma stha* Wh “Since formerly (? *adás*) going forth together, ye resounded (*nad*) when the dragon was slain, therefore ye are streams (*nadī́*) by name.”

The signature verb *ní* √*śā* ‘whet down’ that we have met a number of times before (see comm. ad vs. 6) now implicitly takes Sudās as its subject, as a sort of climactic usage.

The PN *yudhyāmadhí* is obviously a speaking name, with some form of √*yudh* ‘fight’ embedded in it. See Old for various possibilites for its formation. It is tempting to see as its base a 1st pl. middle **yúdhyāmahi* “let’s fight,” with the older expected 1st pl. ending **-madhi* before de-occlusion.

VII.19 Indra

VII.19.1: Rhetorically interesting to begin a hymn with a syntactically non-independent verse. This verse consists only of relative clauses (*pace* Ge; see below), which find their main clause referent in the first word of the 2nd verse (and indeed subsequent verses), namely *tvám*. Although 'you' clearly is the referent, the first relative clause of vs. 1 has a 3rd ps. verb (*cyāváyati*), though the second one switches to the 2nd person (*prayantā́si*). It might be possible to attribute the 3rd ps. in ab to attraction to the simile, but such a switch would be very rare.

The simile marker *ná* in pāda a is somewhat misplaced, after the 2nd member of a three-word simile, not the first (*tigmáśṛṅgo vṛṣabhó ná bhīmáḥ*). Ordinarily, given such a structure, the first word would be interpreted as the common term and therefore not a part of the simile proper ("sharp-horned like a fearsome bull"), but Indra doesn't have horns, which should certainly belong to the bull. The wrong position may result from the fact that X *ná bhīmá-*, where X = an animal, appears to be a formulaic structure, esp. *mṛgá- ná bhīmá-* (I.154.2, 190.3, II.33.11, etc.; also *siṃhá- ná bhīmá-* IV.16.14, IX.97.28 and others). This smaller fixed phrase would then be fitted into a simile containing another term. In any case this misplacement is not uncommon.

Ge takes pāda d as a main clause, following the Pp., which analyses *prayantā́si* as containing unaccented *asi*. But this requires him to invent a verb for the relative clause of c ("raubst") for which there is no support – and no need. Already Old suggested accenting *ási* contrary to the Pp.

Old (see also Tichy) also notes the nice example of case disharmony, where both gen. *gáyasya* and acc. *védaḥ* are objects of the agent noun *prayantā́*. As has often been noted, suffix-accented *-tar*-stems generally have genitive complements, as opposed to root-accented ones, which generally take accusatives. But enough exceptions exist to allow *prayantā́* to take both. That *gáyasya* is parallel to *védaḥ* and not to *ádāśuṣaḥ* is shown by passages like IX.23.3 ... *ádāśuṣo gáyam* and VIII.81.7 *ádāśūṣtarasya védaḥ*. It is possible, but not necessary, that *prayantā́si* is a periphrastic future.

I have no explanation for the comparative *súṣvitara-* 'better soma-presser', beyond the occasional use of the comparative for emphasis or intensification, without comparandum.

VII.19.2: Pāda b is repeated in IV.38.7, there of Dadhikrā the racehorse. (This repetition is not noted in Bl RR.) Re at IV.38.7 and Ge here (but not there) take *śúśrūṣamānaḥ* as meaning something like "putting oneself at the disposal (of someone else, here Kutsa)." I assume that they are thinking of the enlarged root √*śruṣ* 'be obedient', but the two meanings seem quite distinct to me – I can't see Indra being obedient to any man – and formally our participle is a well-formed desiderative to √*śru*. In both places I take it as meaning "desiring to be heard/famed'; here Indra also helps out Kutsa, but at least part of his aim is to ensure his own fame. In IV.38.7 there is no subsidiary beneficiary, and so the focus on the subject and his fame is ever clearer. Heenen is similarly puzzled by Ge (238 n. 263) but tr. "(toi qui) en personne as la volonté d'écouter au combat," attributing an active sense to the middle participle.

The word *dā́sam* beginning c plays off both *(á)dāśuṣo* in 1c and *sudā́sam* in 3b.

VII.19.3: Trasadasyu and the Pūrus also appear in IV.38 (vss. 1, 3), which contains the pāda in common with our 2b.

In the publ. tr. the cmpd *vītá-havya-* is rendered ‘whose oblation is worthy pursuing’, but this “potential” meaning is strictly suited rather to *vītí-hotra-* (on which see II.38.1). I would now emend to “whose oblation is pursued’.

VII.19.4: This verse puts into analytic (that is, syntactically independent) form some expressions met as compounds in the previous verse. Most obvious is *(bhū́rīṇi) vṛtrā́ ... haṃsi*, which realizes *vṛtrahátyeṣu* in 3d. (Notice that both refer to plural events, handling their grammatical plurality in different ways.) A real *dásyu-* is destroyed in 4cd, plucked from the name Trasadasyu in 3c. In a slightly different relationship, *devávītau* ‘in pursuit of the gods’ here contains a form of the root √*vī* ‘pursue’ found as 1st compound member in *vītahavyam* ‘whose oblation is pursued’ in 3a. The two compds represent two functionally distinct uses of √*vī*, on which see the disc. in my 2024 IEL article “Vedic Evidence for the Verbal-Governing *dā́ti-vāra-* Compound “Type”: A Critical Reassessment.” And within this verse *nṛ́bhiḥ* doubles the first member of the next word, *nṛmano*.

VII.19.5: This verse presents some interlocking syntactic and lexical problems. Unlike Ge, I take pādas b and c together. Splitting them requires him to supply a verb for b (“brachst”) again lacking support or necessity. Presumably again he is following the Pp, which analyzes *śatatamā́viveṣīḥ* as containing unaccented *aviveṣīḥ*. I prefer to accent it and thus allow it to be the verb of the *yád* clause beginning in b.

In either case *śatatamā́* is a problem. Everyone wants it to be the 100th thing (probably *púr-* ‘fortification’) that Indra destroys (after the 99 in b). Gr suggests reading *śatatamā́m*, which would provide the desired feminine accusative (agreeing with *púr-*), but among other things would damage the meter (since, s.v. *viṣ*, he is still reading an augmented *aviveṣīḥ*). Ge suggests that it [what is unspecified, presumably the sandhi agglomeration] is to be dissolved (“aufzulösen”) into masc. *śatatamám*, and the 100th thing that Indra destroys is Śambara himself. He makes no mention of meter, though this dissolution would cause the same metrical problem. Old suggests supplying neut. pl. *cyautnā́ni* (without translating), but I don’t see how an ordinal “hundredth” can qualify all hundred items in the plural. There is a much simpler solution: to take *śatatamā́* as a feminine instrumental with the old ending *-ā*. Although Old claims (in arguing against Gr) that the fem. stem should be *śatatamī́-*, this is simply wrong. See AiG II.2 §457, which establishes *-ā* as the rule and *-ī* as the rare exception. Cf. for *-tama-*stems *purutámā-* of Uṣas and *mātṛ́tamā-*, and for ordinals the well-attested feminine *prathamā́-*. Or, if Ge is correct that the reference is to Śambara himself, *śatatamā́* can be a masculine instr. sg. In either case the text can stand as it is, with no metrical or sandhi problems, and the syntax can be rescued.

Ge takes *nivéśane* in c as ‘at evening’. The word generally means ‘causing to settle down’ (the usual association of *-ana-*nominals with the transitive-causative *áya-* formations) or, as a noun, ‘settling down’, and is sometimes associated with Savitar’s bringing the world to rest in the evening (IV.53.6, I.35.1, VI.71.2), an association that must have led to Ge’s tr. But the word never otherwise means ‘evening’. I read it with its full lexical value, but with a sinister edge. “Bringing them to rest” is a euphemism like

ásvāpayaḥ ‘you put to sleep’ in 4d. Old mentions the “going to rest” possibility, but opts instead for “in the dwelling place (of the enemy).” Again, there seems to me no reason for this attenuation of the meaning.

The root √*viṣ* means ‘work, work over’, or here ‘work to the end’, again used in a slightly euphemistic sense. Note the phonetic echo between *nivéśane* and *(a)viveṣīr*.

The d pāda is a perfect chiasmus, even to the positioning of a conjunction between verb and object: *áhañ ca vṛtrám námucim utā́han*. The mixture of *ca* and *utá* is curious. Klein (DGRV I.186–87) is not sure how to analyze it; he suggests either that it’s a “both ... and” type of construction, with each conjunction appearing 2nd in its phrase (or so I interpr. his lapidary disc.), or that “*ca* is a sentential conjunction adjoining d to the rest of the stanza, and *utá* conjoins the clauses of d.” I prefer the former.

VII.19.6: *sánā* is generally taken (Gr, Ge) as a neut. pl. adj. ‘old’ agreeing with *bhójanāni*, and this is certainly possible. I find the sentiment somewhat odd, however: to announce to Indra that the delights he has given to his client are “old” seems slighting. I prefer to interpret the word as the 2nd sg. act. impv. to √*san* ‘win’; exactly this form occurs several times in initial position elsewhere. What gives me pause, however, is I.178.4, which contains very parallel phraseology, *sánā tā́ te indra návyā ā́guḥ*, and where I do interpret *sánā* as ‘old’. The difference there is that the poet contrasts the old deeds of Indra with the new ones (*návyā*) that have come and so avoids insulting the god. In any case, either the ‘old’ or the ‘win’ interpretation is possible here, though I have a preference for the latter.

The oblation of Sudās’s that was pursued (*vītáhavyam*) in vs. 3 has now been given by him (*rātáhavyāya*) here, tracking the progress of the sacrifice to the point of mutual benefit of man and god.

The phrase *dāśúṣe sudā́se* “for the pious Sudās” displays syllabic metathesis, *dā-śū* / *su-dā*, with neutralizing play on all three sibilants. The poet seems to like this collocation: see comment above on vs. 2 for connections across three verses and below on VII.20.2.

VII.19.7: My construction of the first hemistich differs from Ge’s, both with regard to the syntactic role of *te* and the sense of *páriṣṭau* and leads to a very different interpretation of the meaning. The latter word, literally ‘encirclement’, is generally taken as always negative, a tight spot or constriction (Ge’s “in dieser Klemme”), but I find this interpretation hard to reconcile with the hic-et-nunc deictic *asyā́m*, since the poet has given no indication that he is currently in distress. (Ge’s note suggests that this is a memory of the situation in VII.18, the Ten Kings battle, but this seems to me an ill-supported attempt to account for the deictic.) I therefore think the *páriṣṭi-* here is positive – Indra’s encirclement (that is, protection) of us now – and *te* is to be construed with *páriṣṭau*: “in this enclosure (that is, protection) of yours.” Weak support for this may be provided by the first pāda of the next verse, 8a, where ... *te* ... *abhíṣṭau*# matches ... *te* ... *páriṣṭau*# here, with rhyming forms and identical morphology – and a parallel positive sense: “in your charge.” There is also a parallel in the next hymn, in roughly the same part of the hymn, with *te asyā́m* as here and a string of locatives: VII.20.8 ... *te asyā́m sumataú ...várūthe ... nṛ́pītau* “in this benevolence of yours, in your defense, in your protection for men.” In our passage Ge (followed by Scar 207) instead takes *te* as the

subject of the infinitive *parādaí*; in order to make this work he has recast the sentence from one with 1st person subject (*mā́ ... bhūma* "may we not be...") to one with 2nd ps. subject: "Nicht sollst du uns ... dem Bösen preisgaben." Scar's tr. maintains the syntactic structure of the original, but otherwise follows Ge's interpretation. Better is Keydana's (*Infinitive im Ṛgveda* 156, 203) interpretation of *parādaí* as a passive infinitive, as I take it – though he still takes *te* as the ultimate agent of the handing over. Again, I don't see that the poet has expressed any fear that Indra will betray them; rather, he hopes that the protection Indra provides them will keep any such ill-fortune from befalling them, a hope that is repeated in the next pāda.

The poet's penchant for case disharmony (see 1cd above) recurs in pāda d, where I read *priyā́saḥ* both with gen. *táva* and with loc. *sūríṣu*.

VII.19.9: I take pāda c with ab, since all three have 3rd ps. subjects referring to Indra's worshipers and clients, with pāda c a rel. cl. beginning with *yé*. Ge, by contrast, connects c with d, although d now refers to the same people in the 1st ps. (*asmā́n vṛṇīṣva* "choose us"). He does not, however, take *asmā́n* as coreferential with the *yé* of c, but rather apparently interprets the relationship between the clauses as a kind of improper relativization: "for the same alliance (*yújyāya tásmai*) as (those) who (*yé*)..." This has the advantage of providing some reason for the final *tásmai*, which I find hard to account for, though I find his way of linking the clauses too tricky. Scar takes the first pāda as a temporal subordinate clause ("As soon as they are in your charge, the men..."). This is worth considering, although I am dubious about the subordinating quality of *sadyáś cid*. In the end, although I am not entirely certain of my own way of putting together the various elements in this verse, I have not been convinced by those of other tr. either.

Note the poet's playful variation on 8a ... *te maghavann abhíṣṭau* with ... *té maghavann abhíṣṭau*, where the simple addition of an accent turns the 2nd ps. sg. into a 3rd ps. pl.

náraḥ śaṃsanti recalls the epithet *nárāśáṃsa*, and then participates in an interweaving of two words for ritual speech: *śaṃsanti <u>ukthaśā́sa</u> <u>ukthā́</u>*.

The lexeme *ví √dāś* occurs only here, as far as I know. Like the idiom *ā́ √yaj* 'attract by sacrifice', it combines a directional preverb with a root of ritual activity, producing a portmanteau "(send) away by perfoming ritual service'. So Old 'hinweghuldigen', which he paraphrases as "honor the god such that the Pāṇis become distant." This construction falls into the category of "unselected object constructions" discussed by Thiago Mendes-Vendurott at the 2025 UCLA IE conference.

On the syntagm *yújyāya √vṝ* see comm. ad IX.88.1.

VII.19.10: We might have expected an unaccented gen. pl. **narām* in the voc. phrase with *nṛtama*, but don't get it. There are no unaccented occurrences of this genitive. It would be possible instead to read *narā́m* with *eté stómāḥ* ("these praises of men"), but *nṛ́tama-* + gen. pl. of *nṛ́-* is a fixed phrase, though usually with *nṛṇā́m* (I.77.4, III.51.4, IV.25.4, etc.). I am now inclined to read *narā́m* with both *stómā(ḥ)* and *nṛtama.* It is positioned between them, adjacent to both. The publ. tr. could be modified to "These praises of men are for you, o most manly of men." The first gen. is subjective. Note the co-occurrence of *narā́m,* the older gen. pl. to *nṛ́-*, and the newer one *nṛṇā́m* in this verse.

Ge takes b as an independent nominal clause, while I consider it a sort of definitional relative clause manqué, that is, lacking the relative pronoun *yé* which would find its referent in the initial *téṣām* of c.

Although d looks to contain a simple conjoined NP, each of whose members consists of two members, *sákhā śū́raḥ* and *avitā́ nṛṇā́m*, each with a *ca* between the two members (so Ge, JSK I.195), I prefer to take *śū́raḥ* as the principal predication of Indra, with the other two terms, *sákhā* and *avitā́ nṛṇā́m*, secondarily predicated of Indra as *śū́ra-*. Although this introduces a minor complication in word order, the fact that *śū́ra-* is overwhelmingly a noun and is used independently of Indra in the very next pāda (11a) persuades me that this analysis is correct, especially since both "comrade" and "helper of men" are terms that explicitly encode Indra's relationship to men, while "champion" is of a different *order*. The distribution of *ca*'s makes no problems for this analysis.

VII.19.11: The finals of pādas a and c echo each other: *... ūtī́ # ... úpa stī́n #*

I think it quite likely that *mimīhy* out of sandhi should be accented (*mimihí*) contra the Pp., given the balanced clausal-type constructions before and after (*úpa no vā́jān ... úpa stī́n*), a possibility Old raises but considers uncertain.

As for the root vowel of this impv., metrical evidence strongly favors reading **mimihi* with short root vowel. On this form and its history see Gunkel 2018 (Fs. Vine). Although he focuses on this 2nd sg. impv., it is likely that the dual forms *mimītam* (I.120.9) and *mimītām* (V.51.11) should also be so read.

VII.20 Indra

This hymn shows some stylistic tics, esp. a penchant for oddly placed particles (vss. 2, 4, 5) and for final enclitics (1d, 7d, 8b, 9a, 9d, as well as the refrain 10d).

VII.20.1: A grammatical figure in the pāda-initial reduplicated *i*-stems, b *cákriḥ*, c *jágmiḥ*, both functioning as verbs (*cákriḥ* takes acc. direct object *ápaḥ*; *jágmiḥ* an acc. goal *nṛṣádanam*). For this type see Grestenberger 2013 (JAOS 133).

ápo náryaḥ is reminiscent of *ápāṃsi ... náryāṇi* in the next hymn (VII.21.4), though there the words form a phrase and here they are in two different cases and numbers.

VII.20.2: Continuing the focus on nominal forms with verbal rection, the poet picks up the pāda-initial agent noun *trātā́* of 1d and deploys three more pāda-initial nominative *tar*-stems in 2a, c, d: *hántā*, *kártā*, and *dā́tā*, each with an acc. object (*vṛtrám*, *ulokám*, and *vásu* respectively). Although pāda b lacks a subject *tar*-stem, it does have one as object: *jaritā́ram*. The stem that began it all, *trātā́* in 1d, contrasts with those in vs. 2 by being suffix-accented, and it should therefore, according to general practice, have a genitive complement. I suggest that it's not an accident that its object is the enclitic *naḥ*, which could be accusative (and thus parallel with the objects in vs. 2) or genitive (and thus conform to the usual rule). Recall this poet's tricky case syntax with the *tar*-stem *prayantā́* in VII.19.1.

Because *prā́vīt ... ūtī́* is an etymological figure, however disguised, I would slightly alter the tr. to "helped ... with his help." See also *ávobhiḥ* in 1c.

The occurrence of parallel datives *sudā́se* (c) and *dāśúṣe* (d) recall their collocation in VII.19.6; see comments there.

The phrase *áha vaí* (*áha vā́* in sandhi) interrupting the VP is very peculiar. It is easier to account for the *vaí* than the *áha*: the particle *vaí*, rather rare in the RV though very common in Vedic prose, is often found directly before the particle *u*. In this hymn it occurs twice (also 4d), in both cases before *u*, though not the particle *u.* Here before *ulokám,* which by most accounts is a haplology of **urú [*ulú] lokám*, and in 4d before the perfect *uvoca.* I have no explanation for *áha*, whose function is also opaque to me in general. Although *áha* often takes Wackernagel (or modified Wackernagel) position, it is more flexibly positioned than most RVic particles, so showing up in the middle of the pāda as here is not as anomalous as it might be. My exclamatory tr. is meant to signal the interruptive quality of the phrase, but makes no claims as to its semantic accuracy. I suspect that the poet is indulging in phonological play (one faint possibility: *áha vā́ u* mimics the opening of the next pāda, *dā́tā vásu*) or morphological or lexical manipulation, but it's too deep for me.

VII.20.3: *khaja-* lacks an etymology (see EWA s.v. *khaja-kṛ́t-*), but embedded in an epithet of Indra in martial contexts like this, 'tumult' serves as well as anything else.

The particle *īm* here lacks its usual accusative function (see Jamison 2002) and does not take its usual Wackernagel position; it therefore reminds us a bit of the similarly irrational *áha vaí* of the preceding verse. However, *īm* does serve to forestall a hiatus between *janúṣā* and *áṣaḷḥaḥ* and its position immediately after the former can be taken to signal that *janúṣā áṣaḷḥaḥ* are to be construed together. For another example of *janúṣem* see the next hymn (VII.21.1).

Pāda c is very similar to X.29.8 *vy ā́naḍ índraḥ pṛ́tanāḥ svójā(ḥ)*, though the verbs, despite their surface similarity (*āse* [*āsa* in sandhi], *ānaṭ*), belong to different roots: √*as* and *(n)aś* respectively. Bloomfield (RReps) is adamant that the passages must mean the same thing: *vy ā́se* 'threw himself through' → 'pervaded', exactly parallel to *vy ā́naṭ* 'pervaded'. But although the two passages are obviously in conversation with each other – and I also agree with Bloomfield that *pṛ́tanā-* should have the same sense in both (though not, per Bl, 'battle'), this does not mean, in my view, that they have to be identical – the sly play on the verbal roots shows that. I take *ví* √*as* here as in V.55.6 *víśvā ít spṛ́dho maruto vy àsyatha* "O Maruts, you disperse all rival contenders."

Note the sibiliant play beginning with *samádvā* and continuing through the end of the hemistich.

VII.20.4: Again the poet plays with case disharmony, construing both inst. *ándhasā* and loc. *mádeṣu* with *uvoca*.

Note again the apparently functionless *vaí* and see disc. above ad vs. 2.

VII.20.5: Once again a particle is positioned oddly: *ádha* in the middle of the relative clause (versus properly positioned *ádhā* in 3d). Klein (II.130) suggests the *ádha* here "is either a subclausal conjunction [but conjoining what? sj] or weakly conjoins the second distich with the first," but neither explanation accounts for the mid-pāda position.

VII.20.6: On *bhreṣate* as an *s*-aor. subj. to √*bhrī*, see KH (Fs. Schubring = Aufs. 29–34, Narten Sig. Aor. 184). The only other verb form attested to this root is *bhrīṇánti* in II.28.7. Note the phonetic echo *bhreṣate ... reṣat*.

The final pāda has two linked uncertainties: the identity of the verb and the case form of *rāyá*. Though the Pp. reads dat. *rāyé*, gen.-abl. *rā̆yaḥ* is equally possible. The choice depends in great part on the analysis of the verb *kṣáyat*: whether it belongs to √*kṣi* 'dwell' or √*kṣā* 'rule'. If the former, it would be a subjunctive; if the latter, an injunctive. The immediate context favors a subjunctive (*dádhate* in the rel. clause attached to this main clause, plus *bhreṣate* [on this form as an s-aor. subj. to √*bhrī*, see EWA s.v. *bhrī,* with ref. to Hoffmann]*, reṣat* probably, and *āvívāsāt* in ab), but this does not necessarily decide for an affiliation to 'dwell', because there are no overt subjunctives to the Class I present of 'rule over' (no **kṣáyāt*) and the injunctive might function modally here. Parallel passages cut both ways. On the one hand, 'rule' regularly takes the gen. of 'wealth': cf. I.51.14 (of Indra) *rāyáḥ kṣayati*, VII.93.2 *kṣáyantau rāyáḥ* (Indra and Agni), X.106.7 *kṣayad rayīṇā̆m* (though in an otherwise incomprehensible verse); on the other, a form of 'dwell' appears in a parallel passage with the material from the end of the pāda: VI.3.1 ... *sá kṣesad ṛtapā̆ ṛtejā̆ḥ*. Old, having considered both possibilities, opts (slightly) for the latter; Ge's tr. also assumes an affiliation with 'dwell' and a dat. *rāyé*: "der wird im Frieden lassen, um zu Reichtum (zu gelangen)." The publ. tr. instead chooses 'rule over' and gen. *rāyáḥ*, though I recognize that both possibilities were probably in the poet's mind. One slender support for my choice may be the parallel phrase in 9d ... *vásva ā́ śakaḥ*... "you hold power over goods," with gen. *vásvaḥ* reprising the gen. *rāyáḥ* that opens 9c.

VII.20.7: By my interpr. (and Ge's) *śíkṣan* is a predicated pres. participle, parallel to the subjunctive *áyat* in the 2nd clause; it seems to have adopted the modal sense of this parallel finite verb.

Note the play between the two initial words of pādas a and b: *yád* and *áyad* (*áyaj* in sandhi), where the second is actually a subjunctive to the root present of √*i* 'go'.

The question in c is not overtly marked, but I follow both Old and Ge in taking it as such.

VII.20.8: *ághnataḥ* is a gen. sg. negated act. pres. part. modifying *te* 'of you' in the preceding pāda; the heavy modal tr. is a concession to English.

VII.20.9: *stāmú-* is a hapax and there is no agreed upon etymology or interpretation. Gr takes it as belonging to √*stan* 'thunder' and meaning something like 'sighing' (with no explanation of the semantic distance), and he is followed implicitly by Oberlies (II.210). KEWA also registers this idea, but in EWA it seems to have been abandoned, without anything to replace it. Ge, on the other hand, connects it to the root √*stā* 'steal', a suggestion I find very appealing. However, his further interpretation does not seem compelling: "und verstohlen hat (der Sänger) geklagt." The structure of the hemistich, with two clauses joined by *utá*, each with a verb of noisemaking, whose subject in the first clause is an animal, suggests that an animal should be the subject of the second as well. I therefore suggest that *stāmú-* means 'thieving' and it is a well-known characteristic of some animal or other. I suggest 'monkey': monkeys are of course well

known for thievery and Vṛṣākapi, Indra's monkey pal in X.86, steals "the goodies of the Arya" (X.86.1). Monkeys are also know for their sharp cries. The presence of *vṛ́ṣā* (recalling Vṛṣākapi) in pāda a may support this idea, but of course all of this is very tentative, and in particular I have no explanation for why configuring his praise as a screeching monkey would please Indra (unless, again, to remind him of his friend Vṛṣākapi). An alternative animal possibility is the magpie, which has a reputation at least in the West as a thief (cf. Rossini's opera "The Thieving Magpie" [La gazza ladra]), although the internet tells me that this reputation is undeserved. There are species of magpies in northern India and they do make sharp cries.

While it is impossible to be certain about the meaning and etymology of the hapax, as often with hapaxes and other rare words it is possible to suggest reasons why it appears in just this passage. Its position in its pāda is identical to that of *stómo* in the preceding pāda, and it echoes that word phonologically. In fact, the phonological play is quite subtle: underlyingly *stoma* = *s t a u m a*, and *stāmu* = *s t a a m u,* with the vowels around the *m* simply reversed.

The old idea that *stāmú-* is cognate to Grk. στωμυλός 'talkative, loquacious' was revived with considerable discussion by Ch. de Lamberterie (*Les adjectifs grecs en* -υς, 1990: 704–14 [esp. 704–5]) and recently considered anew and more or less dismissed as impossible to demonstrate by Brent Vine ("Greek στωμυλός 'chatty'," *Indo-European Linguistics* 7 [2019]). Although the coincidence of form and possible semantics is suggestive, I think it unlikely that an entirely isolated *stāmú-* (no root, no related nominal forms) would have been preserved in this sense from hoary antiquity, and although it might have inhabited a lower register and therefore generally not surface in "high" Vedic, I know of no possible MIA correspondents. Furthermore, the anagramatic word play noted above makes it more likely that the word is semi-artificial, though based on attested material -- hence my favoring of the √*stā* 'steal' connection.

Note the phonological figure *āgan ... aṅgá* in cd.

The return of the singer (*jaritár-*) in the last two verses of this hymn (9c, 10c) forms a faint ring with his appearance in 2b.

VII.21 Indra

VII.21.1: Some recycling and recombination from the last hymn: *janúṣem uvoca* combines *janúṣem* (20.3b) and *uvoca* (20.4d), each in its metrical position, and *ándhaso mádeṣu* echoes *ándhasā mádeṣu* of 20.4d.

devám appears to be one of the few adjectival forms of the stem, modifying neut. *ándhaḥ*. Although I would like to reduce the number of these supposed adjectival forms to zero, it is difficult to see what else to do with it here.

VII.21.2: In the *-áya*-book (Jamison 1983: 50), I take *vipáyanti* as intransitive, in keeping with its vocalism, supplying a form of √*sad*, which is extraordinarily common with *barhís-*: "(Sitting on) the barhis, they become inspired." However, the publ. tr. takes *vipáyanti* as transitive, despite the vocalism, both to avoid supplying extraneous matter and because I did not think the pressing stones that are the verb's unexpressed subj. should sit on the barhis. I failed to note that in V.31.12, adduced by Ge, the pressing stone "will be brought down to the vedi" (*áva védim bhriyāte*). Since the vedi is where

the barhis is strewn, the passage seems to put the stone in a position actually to "sit on the barhis." See also VIII.27.1 *agnír ukthé puróhito grāvāṇo barhír adhvaré* "Agni has been set in front while the solemn speech (is being recited), as have the pressing stones and the ritual grass while the ceremony (is going forth)," which has the stones and the barhis set out together, and III.42.2, which describes soma as *barhiṣṭhāṃ grāvabhiḥ sutám* "stationed on the ritual grass, pressed by stones." The transitive interpr. found in the publ. tr. has the merit of not requiring an extra verb to be supplied, but what ritual event it might depict is unclear. I suppose that the vigorous activity that pressing required would make the material on which the pressing apparatus was placed (presumably the barhis) tremble. But I now tentatively favor my old 1983 intransitive interpr., which takes better account of the vocalism. Moreover, since what is most often emphasized about the pressing stones is the noise they make, "become inspired" (like *víprа*s 'inspired poets') would express this well-known characteristic of theirs. Note in the next hymn, VII.22.4ab, where the call of the pressing stone (*hávam ... ádreḥ*) is parallel to the thought of the inspired poet (*víprasya ... manīṣām*). Indeed in that passage the *vípra* might refer to the pressing stone itself. On the vedi as the place where the soma pressing apparatus is placed, see Oberlies, *Der Rigveda und seine Religion,* 254.

Ge takes *gṛbhād ā* as "bis zur Handhabung," but in that use of the ablative with *ā* ("all the way to") the noun follows the *ā* (see Gr s.v. *ā*). Better to interpret it as a standard ablative expressing the place/person from which the pressing stones are being brought to the ritual ground for use (so, e.g., Scar 591). Old argues persuasively that *gṛbhá-* is an agent noun. For √*grabh* with the pressing stones, see *grāva-grābhá-* (I.162.5), the title of a functionary, "Handler of the Pressing Stones."

dūráüpabdaḥ must be nominative plural, so, although the stem is universally (Gr, EWA, AiG II.2.75) given as thematic, this form (versus *upabdaíḥ* VII.104.17) must belong to a root noun. Gr suggests instead reading *-upabdās*, an emendation Old rejects as unnecessary without commenting on the stem.

VII.21.4: Ge supplies a second, accusative, form of *āyudha-* as object of *viveṣa* and supplies "enemies" as the referent of *eṣām* 'of them', while making the accusative phrase in b the object of *vidvān* 'knowing': "Der Fürchtbare hat mit den Waffen ihre (Waffen) abgetan, der aller mannhaften Werke kundig ist." But there are several reasons to reject this interpretation in addition to the necessity of supplying a significant word. The root √*viṣ* 'labor, bring to fulfillment' does not mean 'abtun' (dismiss, brush aside). Moreover it regularly takes *ápas-* 'work', a form of which appears in pāda b, as object; see esp. IV.19.10 *ápāṃsi ... náryāviveṣīḥ*. By contrast, the participle *vidvān* is usually used absolutely, without object. As for the referent of *eṣām* it would of course possible to supply "enemies," although they are not mentioned previously in the hymn: the only preceding masc. or neut. plurals are the pressing stones (subject of the whole of vs. 2), the "finely made (fortifications)" of 3d, and, in a simile, the charioteers in 3c. Because the pressing stones are extravagantly celebrated in vs. 2 and called Indra's "companions," I think it likely that they are the referents here: the soma they produce is their weapon, and this soma fuels Indra's labors. This is also Caland-Henry's solution (*L'Agniṣṭoma*, p. 285 and n. 3).

I supply "fortifications" (*púraḥ*) from c as the obj. of *jaghāna* in d. It is possible that we are meant to think instead (or in addition) of the archetypal obj. of this verb, the

serpent Vṛtra, who is concealed in the instr. *(m)ahi(nā́)* directly before the verb. Cf. *áhinā* in 3b.

The first word of the verse, *bhīmáḥ*, picks up the last word of vs. 3, *bhīṣā́*.

VII.21.5: A verse with several rare words. The neut. pl. *vándanā* in b is unclear; the neut. sg. *vándanam* in VII.50.2 appears to be some medical condition, and in AV VII.115.2 it refers to some sort of negatively viewed plant (a parasitic plant, acdg. to Gr; see also EWA s.v.), neither of which is helpful here. There is also the homonymous PN *vándana-* of a client of the Aśvins, mostly localized in the Kutsa and Kakṣīvant Aśvin hymns in Maṇḍala I (see comm. ad I.112.5). Here I think it better to start with the root √*vand* 'praise, extol' and give it a negative twist appropriate to the context, hence my 'sycophant': praise gone wrong. A similar negative interpretation is needed for the usually positive term *vedyā́-* in the same phrase. Why *vándanā* is neuter and not masculine isn't clear to me; perhaps a better tr. would be "sycophancy, sycophantic (words)." With sorcerers and flatterers in this first hemistich we then have two different ways in which *ṛtá* can be undermined within our own community, while the *arí-* 'stranger' whose ways are contrary to ours and the phallus-worshippers in the second hemistich represent external threats to *ṛtá-*.

In c *víṣuṇa-* ordinarily means 'variable, various', which here shades into 'variant' and, with the negative reading prevailing in this verse, 'contrary'.

The lexeme *ápi* √*gā* occurs in the RV only here, but *ápi* √*gam* can have a sexual sense ("inire feminam" as Gr chastely phrases it), and that image would be appropriate here, given the grammatical subject.

VII.21.6: I take the injunc. *bhūḥ* in the first pāda as imperatival, although Ge's preterital value is also possible.

The particle *ádha* is once again oddly positioned; cf. VII.20.5. In this case, however, it seems a mistake for (or a play on?) *ádhi*, which regularly appears with locatives (esp. cosmological locatives) in just this metrical position – including a number of times with the phonological variant of the endingless loc. *jmán* here, namely the *i*-loc. *kṣámi*: *... ádhi kṣámi#* (5x, e.g., I.25.18). See also nearby pāda-initial *ádhi kṣámi* in VII.27.3b.

Pāda b contains one of the standardly cited examples of neut. pl. subject with singular verb: *... vivyak ... rájāṃsi*.

The verb in d, *vividat*, is morphologically slightly problematic. Following Gr I interpret it as a subjunctive to the act. pf. of √*vid* 'find', but we ought then to have full-gr. root syllable **vivedat*. Kü (493) takes it as an injunctive "in komprehensivem Gebrauch," but the perfect injunctive ought not to be thematic, but rather **vivet* (like *vivyak* in b). In the end I take it as a wrongly formed subjunctive.

Ge. construes the enclitic *te* with *ántam*: "... dein Ende finden," but the enclitic seems wrongly positioned for this interpretation (insofar as we understand the positioning of adnominal enclitics – but see *te asuryā́ya* in 7a), and at least one parallel passage suggests that it is the end of his *śávas-* that is at issue: I.100.15 *ná ... śávaso ántam āpuḥ*.

VII.21.7: Note the juxtaposition of the gods (*devā́ḥ*) and Indra's "lordship" (*asuryā́ya*).

For the meaning of the idiom *ánu √mā*, see Kü (279). It parallels the concessive sense of *ánu √dā* 'concede' and *ánu √dhā* 'id.'

VII.21.8–9: Final *varūtā́* of 8d is matched by final *tarutra* in 9b.

VII.21.8: The "man like you" (*tvā́vataḥ*) is the human patron because he, too, distributes largesse. So also Ge (n. 8d).

VII.21.9: *vanvántu* 'let them combat' and *vanúṣām* 'rapacious ones' are presumably derived from the originally separate roots *van* 'win, vanquish' and *van*^{i} 'love, desire', but since these roots have become synchronically entangled, the pair presents itself like an etymological figure, like I.132.1=VIII.40.7 *vanuyā́ma vanuṣyátaḥ* "may we win against those who seek to win."

VII.21.10: This verse is identical to the final verse of the last hymn (VII.20.10), but in this case *maghávāno junánti* "the bounteous ones incite (us)" is the positive equivalent of the negative *ná ... jūjuvur naḥ* "They do not incite us" in vs. 5, where the internal enemies served as subject.

VII.22 Indra

VII.22.2: I tr. *ásti* as an existential ("exists to be yoked") rather than simply a copula with the predicated gerundive *yújyaḥ* ("is to be yoked") because the 3rd sg. pres. of *√as* is almost always an existential, given that the copula is almost always gapped. However, this may be too emphatic a tr., and it is the case that a surface copula is more likely to be found in subordinate clauses than main clauses. See Jamison 1990 ("Tense of the Predicated Past Participle ...," IIJ 33: 1–19) pp. 4-–5. The gerundive + *asi* in 7c (*hávyaḥ ... asi* "you are to be invoked") supports a simple copula interpr. here.

VII.22.3: The position of *ā́* in the middle of the NP *vā́cam ... imā́m* is worth noting. Gr takes it as a preverb with *bódhā*, but *√budh* does not otherwise occur with *ā́*, and its position would not be normal for a preverb in tmesis. Note also that *bódhā* + SPEECH is found in the next vs. (*bódhā ... manīṣā́m*) and in the preceding hymn (VII.21.1d *bódhā ... stómam*), both times without preverb. I am tempted to assume that the poet inserted an unnecessary adverbial *ā́* 'here' to produce a proper cadence. Pāda-final *vā́cam émā́m* is also found in IX.97.13, a verse attributed to Upamanyu Vāsiṣṭha, again without obvious function.

VII.22.4: The lexeme *ví √pā* in later Vedic is regularly found in specialized sense in the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, and there it refers to the feat of separating the surā from the other liquid (milk or soma). This sense and context are already found in the late RVic hymn X.131.4 in the med. part. *vipipānā́*. See Old ad loc. (and NGGW 1893, 348–49). Though it has been suggested that this usage belongs to a separate root *√pā* 'go' (see, e.g., EWA s.v. *PĀ*^{3}), this seems unnecessary and somewhat perverse. Although the other *ví √pā* passages (all medial) don't have a Sautrāmaṇī association, I think they (or most of them) belong to this same lexeme, though Old is less certain. Here the stones are separating the

soma juice from the stalk. In IV.16.3 the pressing stone is also the subj., and there is a pressing stone association in III.53.10. However, I.112.15 is more enigmatic. The subj. there is an ant (or someone called "ant"), *vamrá-*, and the vignette occupies half a pāda in a list of the Aśvins' helpful deeds. For further on that passage, see disc. ad loc.

VII.22.5: A nice example of the potential iterative-repetitive value of a reduplicated present (*vivakmi*) reinforced by an adverb (*sádā* 'always').

VII.22.7: The first pāda could also be another obj. of *kṛṇomi* in b.

VII.22.8: Ge seems to take the participle *mányamānasya* as a functional reflexive 'think oneself to be', with the added sense of self-conceit ("der du dir darauf etwas einbildest"). Although I would certainly not ascribe to Indra excessive modesty, in this context, where the poet is emphasizing the poets' inability to capture all of Indra's greatness, I think it unlikely that he is focusing on Indra's egotism. I instead take the participle in a passive sense 'be thought to be', as sometimes elsewhere – *pace* Kulikov (339–40), who follows Gotō.

VII.22.8–9: The subject of the verb in 8b, *úd aśnuvanti,* is not specified. In my view the subject is postponed to 9ab: neither the older nor the younger poets are capable of expressing all of Indra's powers in their formulations. Although this interpretation requires enjambment over a verse boundary, the main clause in 9c to which 9ab is supposedly subordinate has no appropriate referent for the relative pronoun (*asmé* works awkwardly at best), whereas 9ab neatly completes the thought of vs. 8.

However, I now wonder if I should make more effort to integrate 9ab with 9c, as Ge does. He invokes I.48.14, where a similar rel. cl. referring to older seers is very loosely resumed by a 1st plural pronoun, inviting a comparison between the older seers and us. (See comm. ad loc.) It is possible that here we could assume a suppressed **téṣu* in the main cl., parallel to *asmé*, and I would now suggest an alt. tr. of 9: "The older seers and the new ones, the inspired poets, who created sacred formulations, Indra, / let your friendly fellowship be among us (as among them)."

The publ. tr. interpr. *asmé* as a dat. But the parallel in IV.10.8 *śivā̃ naḥ sakhyā̃ sántu ... devéṣu yuṣmé*, where the *-mé* pronominal form is anchored as a loc. by *devéṣu*, makes a loc. reading more likely. Cf. also VI.18.5 *tán naḥ pratnáṃ sakhyám astu yuṣmé*. I would therefore change the tr. to "Let your friendly fellowship be among [or, with] us."

VII.23 Indra

VII.23.1: I follow Ge in taking *upaśrotā̃* as a periphrastic future (contra Tichy, 189, 364).

VII.23.2: Note the echoes at the beginning and end of the first pāda: *áyāmi ... (dev)ájāmi(r).* As often, the local patterns created by the use of hapaxes (as *devájāmi-* is in the RV) may help account for their deployment.

I don't understand Ge's rendering of pāda b, where he seems to take singular *ghóṣa(ḥ)* of pāda a as the implied subject of plural *irajyánta*. I take the verb as a

contrastive passive/reflexive to the otherwise active stem, more or less following Old's interpretation, with *śurúdhaḥ* as subject.

The root noun cmpd *vívāc-* echoes the redupl. pres. *vivakmi* in the preceding hymn, VII.22.5, though of course the *vi*'s have nothing to do with each, being the preverb and the reduplicating syllable respectively.

VII.23.4: 'Teams' (*niyút-*) often appear in context with Vāyu and his driving. Often, of course, they are his teams, but here and frequently elsewhere the 'teams' clearly stand for our poetic thoughts. Cf., e.g., I.135.2, VI.47.14, X.26.1. Therefore, it is unnecessary to supply, with Ge, a verb of guiding or yoking to make the teams into Vāyu's.

The instr. *dhībhíḥ* is taken in the publ. tr. as an instr. of accompaniment, but it could also be an instr. of price/exchange: "in exchange for (our) visionary thoughts."

VII.23.5: The syntactic frame of *dáyase* here is wrong: it ordinarily takes an accusative of the material distributed and a dative of recipient on the rare occasions on which the recipient is made explicit. A clear example is found in the preceding verse, 4d ... *dáyase ví vājān*, also nearby VII.21.7 *maghāni dayate*. The position of *hí* is also anomalous, though note that it exactly replicates the position of *ví* in the phrase in the preceding verse just cited and may well owe its position to this rhyme. Despite the syntactic aberrancy I think that *mártān* must represent the recipient, and the parallelism of the *dáyase* phrases in the adjacent verses has imposed the accusative recipient. (There is also an apparent double accusative, of goods and recipient, in one other passage: VI.37.4 *maghā́ ... dáyase ví sūrī́n* "you apportion bounties to our patrons.")

VII.24 Indra

VII.24.1: The conjoined phrase *avitā́ vṛdhé ca* is not syntactically parallel in the strict sense, but both the agent noun *avitár-* and the purpose dative *vṛdhé* are properly construed with the 2nd sg. copula, subjunctive *ásaḥ*. For the latter, cf., e.g., I.89.5 ... *yáthā ... ásad vṛdhé*, and for the cooccurrence of the two terms VI.33.4 ... *avitā́ vṛdhé bhūḥ*.

VII.24.2: The striking expression "your mind ... has been captured" presumably indicates that our successful preparations for the ritual have forcibly brought Indra to the soma sacrifice, with the implication that he is prevented from going to the sacrifices of others.

In pāda a *dvibárhāḥ* appears to be a masc. nom. sg., though I take it (as Ge does) as modifying neut. *mánaḥ*. Gr, by contrast, suggests that it belongs with masc. *sutáḥ sómaḥ* in the following pāda. Although Gr's solution might seem to be grammatically more satisfactory, on several occasions *dvibárhā(ḥ)* does seem to modify a neut.: I.114.10, VII.8.6, possibly IV.5.3, and AIG III.288 allows neut. sg. to *-as*-stem adj. in *-āḥ*. In most instances, as here, the *-āḥ* is pāda-final, and so the long vowel isn't metrically guaranteed. See on this phenomenon also comm. ad II.31.5.

Gotō (1st Cl., 226 n. 483) interprets *bharate* in c not as a passive (with Gr, Ge, and me; also H-P Schmidt, Fs. Nyberg), but as a self-involved middle: "Lobpreisung, deren Milchstrom losgelassen ist, bringt [ihre Milch] dar," on the basis of his principle that medial Class I presents cannot be used passively. But in my opinion at least, this principle cannot be maintained in general, and certainly in this context, with passive

expressions dominating the first hemistich, a passive reading is most natural and the image of the praise hymn bringing its own milk borders on the comic.

With others I take pāda d as an extension of c, with *iyám ... manīṣā́* an appositive to *suvṛktíḥ*. However, it would be possible to take it independently: "this inspired thought is constantly invoking Indra," since, though fairly rare, predicated present participles do exist, and the short staccato clauses of the earlier part of the hymn may invite an independent reading here.

VII.24.3: Despite its position, *tavásam* should not modify *āṅgūṣám*, though that is grammatically possible, but *tvā*, since the adjective is a regular epithet of Indra.

VII.24.4: The intens. part. *várīvṛjat* can only be intransitive here, as there is nothing overt or latent that could serve as object (so also Ge "zu uns einbiegend," Schaeffer [191] "immer wieder (zu uns) einbiegend" -- though with a different nuance from my tr.). However, forms to the root √*vṛj* 'twist' are otherwise always transitive, including the other ex. of the intens. part. (VI.58.2). I do not have an explanation.

VII.24.5: Uncompounded vṛddhied *vā́h-* to √*vah* 'convey' is attested only here, but it is common in compounds, e.g., *indra-vā́h-* (4x). See Scar (473-80; for the grade of the root, esp. 479).

The two different simile markers in b (*iva ... ná*) may be highlighting two different aspects of the complex simile.

The genitive of goods with √*īḍ* 'invoke' is somewhat aberrant. Although for this root Gr allows acc., dat., or gen. of the material desired, the only other genitive passage he cites is VIII.31.14, where the genitive is otherwise to be construed. However, there seems nothing else to do with *vásūnām*, and the construction is reminiscent of nearby VII.32.5 ... *śrútkarṇa īyate vásūnām* "he of listening ears is implored for goods." Moreover, in X.20.2 *agním īḷe bhujā́m*, the gen. pl. *bhujā́m* is best interpr. this way ("I invoke Agni for delights"), contra the standard interpr. Alternatively we could assume the gapping of a noun like *sambháraṇam* 'assemblage' as in the next hymn, VII.25.2d *sambháraṇaṃ vásūnām*, but this seems less likely.

In d the *śrómatam* is presumably the 'hearing" that gods extend to men's hymns. See VII.32.5 just cited for a similar sentiment.

The simile *divī́va dyā́m* is opaque to me. Ge tr. "Wie Tag auf Tag," but neither of these case forms of *div-/dyu-* is used temporally, but only spatially of 'heaven'. Placing "heaven upon heaven" must refer to Indra's cosmogonic deeds, but the connection with Indra's activity in the frame is vague. Old believes that setting heaven on heaven means that Indra is fixing heaven in its proper place.

VII.24.6: For *pūrdhi* see EWA s.v. *PAR*$^{I\bar{1}2}$ 'give'.

VII.25 Indra

VII.25.1: Although *mahá(ḥ)* in the first pāda is a genitive, I have tr. it in the vocative phrase to avoid the awkward "(Be) here with the help of you, the great one, o strong Indra."

Ge supplies 'mind' from d as the subject of the first pāda, but this seems unnecessary.

I take pāda c as a clause parallel to b, with the *yád* in b having domain over both, hence accented *pátāti* in c. By contrast, Ge (see also Old) takes it as a circumstantial clause dependent on d and supplies "(Wenn)." This is certainly possible, but my solution seems simpler.

The threatened possibility of Indra's wandering mind may account for the capturing of his mind in the previous hymn, VII.24.2.

VII.25.4: The prohibitive clause *ná mardhīḥ* is of course grammatically incorrect. We expect *mā́* with the injunctive in prohibitives, and in fact find it with this same stem several times: *mā́ no mardhīḥ* IV.20.10, *mā́ no mardhiṣṭam* VII.73.4, 74.3, always with the 1st pl. enclitic following the *mā́*. Non-prohibitive forms of √*mṛdh* almost always occur with the negative *ná*, e.g., *ná mardhanti* (I.166.2, III.54.14); there are no positive attestations of this verb. Our passage must be an odd conflation of the prohibitive passages with enclitic *no* and the non-prohibitive passages with negative *ná*. Or alternatively, and in my opinion less likely, this is a non-prohibitive use of the injunctive: "you do/did not neglect." That, however, is Hoffmann's solution (Injunk., 101), taking it "als allgemeine Eigenschaft" of Indra's: "du lässt nicht im Stich." See his discussion, where he also points out that that **mā́ mardhīḥ* would be metrically bad.

VII.25.5: The opening of my tr. of this verse is meant to capture the odd order of noun and demonstrative, *kútsā eté* ...

With Ge I supply a form of √*ṛc* 'chant' as the main verb of the first hemistich, since this verb takes *śū́ṣám* as object in a number of passages (e.g., I.9.10, X.96.2). Cf. nearby VII.23.6 *vásiṣṭhāso abhí arcanty arkaíḥ*, with the nom. pl. subj. of a group of contemporary singers and the verb √*ṛc* in the last vs. of the hymn (VII.25.6 is repeated from VII.24.6).

VII.26 Indra

On the intricate structure of this hymn, see the publ. intro.

VII.26.1: *nṛvát* in d may, as frequently, be adverbial ("I manfully beget...") or, as in the publ. tr., a neuter acc. sg. modifying *ukthám*.

VII.26.3: On *ní* √*mṛj* see comm. ad II.38.3. The idiomatic sense 'drag down forcefully' (as in I.140.2, where Agni drags down trees like an elephant) allows the idiom to develop a sense not only of coercion (on the part of the agent) but of submission (on the part of the object), which is probably responsible for its use of a husband's action towards his wives.

The use of *sárva-* rather than *víśva-* for 'all' may be a sign of lateness.

VII.26.4: The *utá* of pāda a is echoed by *ūtáyo* in c, which in turn is picked up by *ūtáye* in 5a.

Pāda b opens with *ékaḥ* 'one, single' and c ends with *pūrvī́ḥ* 'many', a contrast that appears to be hightlighted.

The verb *saścata* in d is morphologically ambiguous. My publ. tr. follows Ge in rendering it as a modal (Ge "... sollen ... zufallen," SWJ "will be companions"). Ge does not, however, comment on the form. Gr identifies it as a 3rd pl. to an athematic redupl. stem *saśc-*; since this stem precedes and is distinct from his "schwaches Perf. *saśc-*," he must consider it a redupl. pres., as Whitney and Macdonell (VGS) do; Hoffmann (Injunc. 260) likewise calls our form an injunctive. A 3rd pl. mid. injunc. is certainly possible here, but if we wish to maintain the modal value (which, in fact, is not actually necessary), the injunctive is a small embarrassment, since modal value for the injunctive is fairly rare and generally limited to particular forms like *dhā́s*. An alternative would be to take it as a 3rd *singular subjunctive*, possibly built to the perfect stem. The neut. pl. *bhadrā́ṇi ... priyā́ṇi* could serve as subject to the singular verb in the well-known inherited construction, though it is not overwhelmingly common in the RV. Of course, we would far prefer a primary *-te* ending for the middle subj., but I do not think secondary *-ta* is impossible. Alternatively, with an analysis as 3rd plural injunctive, the tr. could be changed to "... are companions to us."

VII.27 Indra

VII.27.2: The relative clause in the first pāda has no overt referent in the main clause of b, but I supply an instr. *téna* (see also Ge's n.; his first alternative, to supply *tám*, is less attractive because *śikṣa-* doesn't ordinarily take an acc.).

I interpret c as containing an implicit pun. The form *vícetā(ḥ)*, masc. nom. sg. of *vícetas-*, derived from the root √*cit* 'perceive', means 'discriminating', hence my 'tell things apart', and is regularly applied to Indra (and other gods). But this leaves *dṛḷhā́* with no verb to govern it. (It cannot be object of *ápa vṛdhi* in d, because the *hí* in c should trigger verbal accent.) I suggest that *vícetā* (in sandhi) might also be secondarily construed as the agent noun of *ví* √*ci* 'pile apart, pull apart', governing *dṛḷhā́*. Of course we would expect the Saṃhitā text to show coalescence of the final vowel of the agent noun and the initial vowel of the next pāda, but the recitational text would not reflect that. Although most agent nouns compounded with preverbs take suffix accent, compare *nícetar-* (I.184.2) to a different root √*ci* 'perceive'. If this suggestion seems too radical, it would also be possible to detach the preverb *ví* from *vícetā(ḥ)* and supply a form of √*vṛ* 'cover' (found in *ápa vṛdhi* in d), producing the familiar lexeme *ví* √*vṛ* 'uncover'.

VII.27.3: The *yád* in b is rather deeper in the clause than I would like, following the prep. phrase as well as its nominative referent. In fact, the syntax here is, at best, loose. The rel. expression *víṣurūpaṃ yád ásti* should belong to an "X and which Y" construction, connecting it to the genitives *jágataś carṣaṇīnā́m*, but it lacks the *ca* usual in such constructions (as well as the genitive antecedent in the main clause, but such gapping is standard in this construction).

The *cid* in d is somewhat surprising: *cid* generally means 'even', but "even when praised" (*úpastutaś cid*) is the opposite of what we should expect. Both Ge and I have avoided this problem by tr. *cid* almost as a subordinator or at least a circumstantial (Ge "zumal da ...," SWJ "just when"). I now wonder if it expresses anticipatory polarity with *nū́ cid* in the following pāda (4a). Since *nū́ cid* means 'never', *cid* in 3d could mean 'always'.

VII.27.4: Note the rhyming pāda-final *... (sáh)ūtī* (a), *... ūtî* (b).

In b Ge takes *dānáḥ* as gen. sg. of *dāmán-*, dependent on *vā́jam*: "... den Lohn der Gabe." This is possible, though it would be more natural to have *vā́jam* as object of some form of √*dā* (esp. given the parallel he cites, VI.45.23 *dānám vā́jasya*, with *vā́jasya* dependent on *dānám*). I therefore prefer to take *dānáḥ* as the ablative singular of the *mán-* stem, with verbal rection, or, possibly (but somewhat farfetched) the nom. sg. of an otherwise unattested medial root aorist participle of √*dā*.

The combination of *abhí* with √*vī* 'pursue' would occur only here in the RV (and the other saṃhitās); Ge renders it as 'willkommen'. I suggest that it belongs rather to √*vyā* 'envelop' and continues the theme of confinement found in 1d and 2d. The idea here is that the cow was once enwrapped or enclosed but freed by Indra to swell for us. It is possible that *abhívītā* is actually a pun on both those roots, and the tr. should reflect this ambiguity: "... gift-cow swells ..., (previously) enclosed, (now to be) pursued by his comrades," vel sim. The presence of *vyántaḥ* 'pursuing' in 5c supports this possibility.

VII.28 Indra

VII.28.1: The 2nd hemistich begins and ends with a form of *víśva-* 'all': *#víśve ... viśvam(-inva)#*.

VII.28.2: Pāda a continues the theme of competitive invocations embodied in the lexeme *ví* √*hvā* in 1c *vihávanta* with *hávam ... ví*, even though the two words are not to be construed together.

"Your greatness" as an agent may seem odd, but consider "your majesty, your highness," which pose no such problems in English.

I interpret *bráhma* in b as plural rather than singular because of pl. *bráhmā* in 1a and because there are multiple seers in 2b.

I take c with ab, contrary to Ge, who takes it with d. His is technically possible, but it seems to imply a backwards sequence of events: Indra is born only when he has taken the mace in his hand. Ge avoids the problem by radically bleaching the meaning of *janiṣṭhāḥ* to make it an auxiliary or copula substitute ("wardst") with *áṣāḷhaḥ*: "so wardst du unbezwinglich." This seems too high a price, esp. as *jajñé* appears in the next verse, where Ge gives it its full lexical value ("er ist ... geboren").

With *janiṣṭhā áṣāḷhaḥ* compare VII.20.3 *janúṣem áṣāḷhaḥ*.

Although nominative forms of the pres. part. to √*as* 'be', particularly *sán*, are ordinarily concessive, I cannot see a concessive force here. Perhaps it is here almost as a place-holder, to match the *yád* forms in the same position in surrounding pādas (2b, c, 3b [whose *yán* in sandhi rhymes with *sán*]).

VII.28.3: I take ab as dependent on the previous verse, 2d, describing Indra's cosmogonic deeds right after birth. For a novel, but not ultimately persuasive interpretation of this hemistich, see Old. Note that forms of √*nī* open and clause this half-verse: *#táva praṇītī ... ninétha#*.

The position of *yád* in this dependent clause is somewhat disturbing. It occurs in Wackernagel's position in the second pāda (b), but the a-pāda is part of this same clause

and is intimately interwoven with the elements in pāda b: note esp. the acc. pl. *jóhuvānān*, which modifies *nr̥̄n*, the third word in b. Although superficially late position of subordinating elements is not uncommon in the RV (see, e.g., *hí* in pāda c), what precedes is generally syntactically unified, belonging to a single constituent (as in pāda c), but this is not true of the assorted material found in pāda a. I have no explanation.

For the oppositional pun in *sám ... ninétha*, standing for *ví* (*... ninétha*), see the publ. intro. As I explained there, since *sám* and *ví* are preverbs of opposite meaning that frequently pattern together, the *sám* here evokes the *ví* of the lexeme *ví* √*hvā* earlier in the hymn (with √*hvā* present here in the intensive part. *jóhuvānān*) and the various expressions of Indra's pushing *apart* the two world-halves. E.g., nearby VII.23.3c *ví bādhiṣṭa syá ródasī mahitvā́* (I.51.10, VI.29.5, etc.). These associations would prompt the audience to take "bring together" as standing for "push apart," in the standard mythology of Indra.

After the 2nd ps. description of Indra's mythological activity in 2d–3ab, the second half of vs. 3 summarizes the birth in the 3rd person. Ge's interpretation, which makes c parenthetical and connects ab with d despite an awkward change of person, seems clumsy.

VII.28.4: A curious verse. It begins conventionally enough, with a plea to Indra to favor us "though these days" (*ebhíḥ ... áhabhiḥ*). *Which* days is not clear, but I assume it means "now." The verse then turns towards the moral sphere: the peoples (*kṣitáyaḥ*) who are *durmitrá-* 'having bad allies/alliances' (or possibly 'bad allies') are purifying themselves (*pávante*). This pāda presents a number of problems: not only whether *durmitrá-* is a bahuvrīhi or tatpuruṣa (opinion is divided; I take it as the former; see also comm. ad VII.18.15), but also whether the *kṣitáyaḥ* are intrinsically our enemies or are members of our larger community who have fallen into an evil state. *kṣitáyaḥ* are ordinarily presented either positively or neutrally, but see III.18.1, where they are *purudrúhaḥ* 'possessing many deceptions', so an intrinsically hostile reading is possible (if, in my opinion, less likely). If here they are intrinsically hostile, the point may be that if they're sprucing themselves up, we had better get to work on it as well, to meet the challenge of our enemies. If they are not our sworn enemies but peoples with whom we have dealings (or who we ourselves actually are), is it that they are purifying themselves *of* their bad allies/alliances, and therefore are worthy of Indra's aid? Varuṇa, as if evoked by his partner Mitra in *durmitrá-*, then makes his appearance, noting untruth and releasing us from it. As was stated in the intro., Varuṇa's presence is unexpected here. I now wonder if the hymn is specialized for a particular ritual context (signaled by "these days"), perhaps the Varuṇapraghāsa. A purificatory period (like that described in pāda b) might be appropriate then. For this reason I favor an interpretation of pāda b in which the *kṣitáyaḥ* are identified with, or associated with, us.

I would substitute "possessing uncanny power" for "master of artifice."

VII.28.5: As noted in the publ. intro., this verse serves as refrain for VII.28–30, so that it does not respond to (or at least need not respond to) the immediately preceding Varuṇa verse.

In b the genitives *mahó rāyáḥ* and *rā́dhasaḥ* may either be parallel or one dependent on the other. I follow the latter interpr., with the *rāyáḥ* phrase dependent on

rā́dhas-. Although I have not found absolutely diagnostic passages, *rā́dhas*- is regularly modified by adjectives (like 'bovine') that specify the type of *rā́dhas*-, and *mahó rāyáḥ* may be a defining genitive of the same type.

VII.29 Indra

VII.29.1: Pāda d (*dádo maghā́ni maghavann iyānáḥ*) is almost a rewrite of V.28.5ab *vocéma ... maghávānam ...*, *... rā́dhaso yád dádan naḥ*, with *iyānáḥ* 'being implored' substituting for *vocéma* and *rā́dhaḥ* for *maghā́ni*.

VII.29.2: The pāda-initial voc. *bráhman* shows the accent of the neut. *bráhman*- 'formulation', though it clearly belongs to the m. *brahmán*- 'formulator'. The confusion is probably deliberate; the first word after the voc. phrase is *bráhmakṛtim* with the neut. 1st cmpd member, neut. pl. *bráhmāṇi* is found in pāda d, and note that the preceding hymn begins *bráhmā* (V.29.1a), with the neut. (see also V.29.2b).

Just as 1d is a variant of V.28.5ab, so also does 2b (*arvācīnó háribhiḥ yāhi tū́yam*) appear to play on V.28.1ab *... úpa yāhi ..., arvā́ñcas te hárayaḥ ...*, as well as echoing the immediately preceding vs. (29.1b *ā́ tu prá yāhi harivaḥ ...*) with *háribhir yāhi tū́yam*.

VII.29.3: Ge takes *tatane* as a preterite ("... habe ich ... gespannt"), but the full-grade root syllable should signal a subjunctive, which also fits the context better (opt. *daśema* [b], subj. *śṛṇavaḥ* [d]). In contrast Kü (210) considers the form a properly formed indicative and a relic, the regularly developed product of **ta-tn̥-h₂ai*; although this could be possible, it seems unnecessary, given that the context favors a modal form.

Note that the hemistich finals *dāśema* (b) and *hávemā* (d) rhyme, though they are morphologically entirelhy distinct.

VII.30 Indra

VII.30.1: Although tr. as if parallel, *máhi* in d is an adverbial neuter, whereas *mahé* in c is a dative modifying *nṛmnā́ya*. However, "greatly for dominion" seemed overly fussy in English.

VII.30.2: The first hemistich is characterized by alliteration, *v*-s in a, *u*-s and sibilants in b: ***há*v*anta u tv*ā *há*v*yaṃ *vi*v*āci* / *tan**ū́**ṣu śū**rā*ḥ *sū**r**yasya sā*t*aú***.

suhántu in d is a nice example of a proleptic adjective: "weaken the obstacles (so that they are) easily smashed."

VII.31 Indra

VII.31.2: Unlike other interpretors, I take *utá* as marking a new clause, summing up the actions of the poet (who addresses himself in 2a) and his ritual companions (whom he addresses in vs. 1) and comparing them to the actions of the Maruts (*yáthā náraḥ*). Klein (I.409) takes *utá* as connecting vss. 1 and 2, but the position of *utá* in 2b makes that interpretation awkward. Ge takes it as connecting *ukthám* and *dyukṣám* ("... ein Loblied ... und zwar ein himmlisches"). His interpretation assumes a new clause beginning with

yáthā in the middle of b and also takes *cakṛmā́* in c as a sort of dummy verb substituting for a verb of poetic speech ("wie wir Männer es ... gedichtet haben"). But, although "just as we have done" works fine in English as a dummy verb, I am not sure that √*kṛ* can be bleached in the same manner in Sanskrit – though I notice, with some chagrin, that I suggest just such an explanation for *kṛṇóti* in I.77.1. Since the Maruts as Indra's singers are mentioned elsewhere in the hymn (explicitly vs. 8, implicitly vs. 12) and are often called *náraḥ*, my interpretation of b has some support. The position of *yáthā* as a simile marker might be problematic, however; it can be ameliorated by assuming that *dyukṣám* forms part of the simile "as the superior men (made/make) a heavenly (speech), we have made ..." For *dyukṣá-* qualifying 'speech', cf. the compound *dyukṣá-vacas-* (VI.15.4).

VII.31.3–4: Although these verses straddle a tṛca boundary, they are neatly responsive. The repeated *tvám* of vs. 3 is matched by the initial *vayám* of vs. 4, and the repeated *-yú-* ('seeking X') adjectives of 3 are again matched by the *tvāyú-* 'seeking you' of 4a. The final word of both verses is the voc. *vaso*. Even the *gavyú-* 'seeking cows' of 3b has its complement in 4b *vṛṣan* 'o bull'.

There is no obvious noun to supply with *asyá* 'of this' in c. Ge supplies "Schrei," and my "cry" follow him; Klein (I.175) instead "act." The phraseology reminds us of the refrain of I.105 *vittám me asyá rodasī*, which I tr. "Take heed of this (speech) of mine, you two world-halves."

VII.31.5: Contra Ge (and Klein DGRV I.175), I take *váktave* with *nidé*, not with *árāvṇe*, which respects the pāda boundary and also conforms better to the semantic domain of the two nouns: *níd-* 'scorn' is verbal, whereas *árāvan-* is more general. In either interpretation the position of *ca* is a problem, since it appears with the first member of a conjoined NP, not the second. In my interpretation the configuration is X ca X' ... Y, in the Ge/Klein interpretation X ca Y...Y'.

VIII.31.6: On the basis of VIII.92.32 *tváyéd indra yujā́ vayám, práti bruvīmahi spṛ́dhaḥ* "With you as yokemate, we would respond to the challengers," I supply 'challenger' here.

VII.31.6–7: Again there is responsion across the tṛca boundary: 7a *mahā́m utā́si* echoes 6a *tvám vármāsi*.

VII.31.7–8: Echo between 7b *svadhā́varī* and 8b *sayā́varī*, though they occupy different metrical positions.

VII.31.10: Much phonetic and morphological play, with the repeated *prá*'s, the repetition of *mahé mahi-* (note that this replicates the *mahé ... máhi* of VII.30.1cd), and, especially, the chiastic finale: *prá carā carṣaṇiprā́ḥ*, where the last element, the root noun *-prā́ḥ*, is of course unrelated to the first one, the preverb *prá*.

VII.31.12: Because the *vā́ṇī* 'choir' in vs. 8 was qualified as *marútvatī* 'composed of Maruts', I supply Maruts here with pl. *vā́ṇīḥ*. It is also possible, and perhaps preferable,

to assume that the plural indicates that several choirs are involved: both the Maruts and (we) the human singers.

In c *barhayā* could also be 1st sg. subjunctive, as Ge takes it. Either interpretation fits the context fine; I slightly prefer the 2nd sg. imperative, because it returns us to the imperatives of vss. 1–2.

VII.32 Indra

VII.32.2: It is tempting to take *suté* as parallel to *mádhau* in the simile and *sácā* with *ắsate*, rather than taking *suté sácā* as a formulaic phrase with semi-pleonastic *sácā* as the publ. tr. does. The former interpr. would yield "because these who craft sacred formulations for you sit together at [=by/around] the soma like flies on honey when (the soma) is pressed," an interpr. also suggested to me by Dieter Gunkel (p.c., 11/5/15). I chose the latter path because of the parallel cited by Ge, X.50.7 ... *brahmakṛ́taḥ suté sácā* # However, it could be argued that X.50 is presumably a later composition than VII.32 and need not provide unassailable evidence for how VII.32.2 should be interpreted.

VII.32.3: *sudákṣiṇa-* is a triple pun. In its only other RVic occurrence (VIII.33.5) it means 'having a good right (horse)', but it could equally mean 'having a good right (hand)', alluding to the immediately preceding *vájrahasta-* 'having the mace in his hand'. And, in keeping with the theme of giving, it can refer to the *dákṣiṇā-*, the priestly gift' distributed at the dawn sacrifice. This would respond to the *rāyáskāma-* 'desirous of wealth', which opens the verse.

VII.32.5: Ge joins c with b, rather than d as I do. This is possible, but the topic of giving in both c and d connects them thematically.

VII.32.8: *ávase kṛṇudhvam* is close to a periphrastic causative, since "make [=create] (him) for help" is unlikely to take the long-created Indra as object. Zehnder (p. 7 and passim) takes it as such.

VII.32.9: *kṛṇudhvám ... ātúje* similarly functions as a periphrastic causative. So also Zehnder (p. 20 and passim).

VII.32.11: Although 'seeking the prize' is ordinarily accented as a denominative (*vājayánt-*), as opposed to 'incite' (*vājáya-*) with causative accent, in this context, the denominative sense seems clear. See comm. on 14d below.

VII.32.14: *śraddhā́* is most likely instrumental, but its lack of contraction with the following vowel in the Saṃhitā text gives pause. See Old on this problem.

vājī́ vā́jaṃ siṣāsati seems like a variant of *gámad vā́jam vājáyan* in 11a with different emphasis. See also 20a below.

VII.32.17: The relative clause of b, *yá īm bhávanti ājáyaḥ*, is very peculiar. There is no possible referent for the *yé* in either the preceding or the following main clause, and in addition the *īm* lacks function. It seems like a mangled paraphrase of I.81.3 *yád udī́rata*

ājáyaḥ "when (battle-)drives arise/happen," but what caused the mangling is unclear to me. The *yé* can be by "attraction" to the m. nom. pl. *ājáyaḥ* from putative **yád*, and this set of Indra hymns has several examples of functionless *īm* (VII.20.3, 21.1). But it still lacks motivation.

The VP *nā́ma bhikṣate* "desires a share in your name" is striking and a little puzzling. The same phrase *nā́ma √bhaj* is found in V.57.5, but there it means that the Maruts, the subjects of the verb, all share the same name. Here, by contrast, it must be a clever way of saying that everyone calls Indra's name, a novel paraphrase of the common epithet of Indra *puruhūtá-* 'called upon by many', found in this verse and vss. 20 and 26. (The English slang equivalent would be "wants a piece of you.") Ge renders *nā́ma bhikṣate* as "Deinen Namen fleht ... an" (implores), robbing the expression of its vividness.

VII.32.18: The root √*īś* overwhelmingly takes the gen.; the construction here is identified by Gr (s.v. *īś*, col. 236: #8 mit dem Acc.) as mixed: the gen. *yā́vataḥ* is construed with the implied 2nd ps. "as much as you are lord over" (*yā́vatas tvám* [*ī́ṣiṣe*]) in pāda a, which is picked up by the acc. *etā́vad* in the contrary-to-fact "if I were lord over so much" (*yád ... etā́vad ahám ī́śiya*). I think it more likely that *etā́vad* here is a quasi-adverbial summing up of the dependent clause; a more literal tr. would be "if I were lord to such an extent as" or the like. The other passages assembled under Gr's #8 can be variously explained and do not provide strong evidence for an alternative case frame with √*īś*. In III.18.3 *yā́vad* is again adverbial; see the publ. tr. "inasmuch as I am master ..." In VIII.68.7 *ī́śe* is properly construed with a gen. (*kṛṣṭīnā́m*) in its own pāda; the acc. cited by Gr, *pūrvyā́m ánuṣṭutim* in the previous pāda, is probably an acc. of respect (see comm. ad loc.) For nearby VII.37.7 as well as III.51.4, the latter cited only as a possibility by Gr., see comm. ad locc.

The two first-sg. mid. optatives, transmitted as *īśīya* and *rāsīya* should be read with short optative suffix as *īśiya* and *rāsiya*, an observation that goes back to Kuhn in 1863 and frequently reproduced thereafter (e.g., Old Noten). For recent discussion of the forms and their prehistory, see Gunkel, JAOS 142.2 (2022).

The cmpd. *radā-vasu-* 'excavating goods' is analyzed by the Pp. with short 2nd vowel: *rada-vasu-*. Though Gr. suggests the correct reading is **radad-vasu-* (like *kṛtá̍d-vasu-* VIII.31.9), Wackernagel (AiG II.1.316) compares it to the *trasá-dasyu-*, with *-a-* final first member.

VII.32.22: Despite Ge's easy "dessen Auge die Sonne ist," I cannot accept this for *svardṛ́śam*. First, *dṛ́ś-* is never an 'eye', but rather 'seeing' or 'having the appearance of', and furthermore, it's Varuṇa who has the sun as his eye (that is, as his spy). Here I think the point is rather that Indra, like the sun, sees everything in the world, here expressed by the merism "the moving and the still."

VII.32.24: There are two word plays in this verse. The simpler one is between the impv. *bhara* 'bring' in pāda a and the āmreḍita *bhára-bhare* 'at every raid', where the noun *bhára-* has been specialized from '(an occasion for) bearing away' to 'raid'.

The more complex one involves the creation and disappointment of expectations. The verse begins with *abhī́ ṣatáḥ*. The juxtaposition of these two forms (the latter being

the pres. part. to √*as* 'be' in either gen.-abl. sg. or acc. pl.) and their close sandhi, with retroflex initial *ṣ*, invites the audience to fill in the semantics of the lexeme *abhí* √*as* 'be superior'. But to our surprise, at the end of this hemistich we find the semantic opposite, *kánīyasaḥ* 'the lesser ones', requiring us to revise our analysis of the opening, dissolving the presumed lexeme into the directional preverb/preposition *abhí* and the independent pres. participle modifying *kánīyasaḥ* much later in the line. For extensive discussion see Old.

I cannot follow Gr, Old in interpreting *jyā́yaḥ* as voc., but take it, with Ge, as neut. sg. with *tád*. Among other things, AiG III.296 notes only two masc. vocatives in *-īyas* in the RV, this one and *ójīyaḥ* in X.120.4, which is also better taken as a neut.

VII.33 Vasiṣṭha and the Vasiṣṭhids

On the structure and thematics of this famous hymn see the publ. intro., as well as the introductory remarks of both Old and Ge. With VII.18, the account of the Battle of the Ten Kings, it bookends the Indra hymns of VII and contributes its own background to the (fragmentary) narrative of King Sudās and the Ten Kings Battle.

The name *vásiṣṭha-* appears in every vs. of this hymn, primarily at the end of the d pāda: vss. 1, 2, 3, 4, (not 5, 6, though *vásiṣṭha-* appears in both c pādas,) 7, (not 8, though it's in middle of d,) 9, (not 10 though in c, nor 11 though in a,) 12, 13, 14. The name appears both in plural, referring to the present-day Vasiṣṭhids, and singular, of their eponymous ancestor. Generally the plural prevails in the first part of the hymn: a plural form is saliently stationed at the end of vss. 1, 2, 3, 4. The singular is introduced in the interior of the verse in 5 and 6, but the plural returns at the end of vss. 7 and 9 and in the interior of vs. 8. The singular then occupies the last five verses, verse-final in the last three (12–14). It is tempting to see the showcasing of the verse-final plural in the first four verses and verse-final singular in the last three as a deliberate contrasting pattern, but the fits and starts in between make that a more difficult claim. Nonetheless we can say, very generally, that the ritual situation of the current Vasiṣṭhids gives way to an account of the birth of their father (vss. 10–13). Singular Vasiṣṭha in the middle verses 5–6 is mentioned for his participation in the Ten Kings Battle, but the plural Vasiṣṭhas are also part of this battle in 3–4.

VII.33.1: By most accounts this vs. is spoken by Indra, who is the referent of the 1st ps. enclitics *mā* and *me* in pādas a and d and the subj. of 1st ps. *voce* in c.

As noted already ad VII.18.21, Ge has a peculiar interpr. of the verbal lexeme *(abhí) prá* √*mad* as 'go on a pilgrimage', for which there is no support that I can see. Old also rejects this interpr. I follow Old's view that Indra is present at a competing sacrifice -- a constant preoccupation of the Indra hymns of VII -- and recalling the Vasiṣṭhas' ritual service to him, he gets up to leave the sacrifice where he is present to go to theirs. Pāda d is the embedded self-quotation of Indra, providing the reason for his departure for the Vasiṣṭhas.

The descriptors of the Vasiṣṭhas *śvityáñcaḥ ... dakṣiṇatáskapsardāḥ* are found almost identically in VII.83.8 *śvityáñcaḥ ... kapardínaḥ*, where they modify the Tṛtsus, Sudās's fighting force in the Ten Kings Battle, in a hymn much concerned with that battle. Vasiṣṭha was at least an adoptive member of the Tṛtsu clan. See Ge's n. 1a and esp. vss. 5 and 6 in this hymn.

Despite the position of the generally sentential, Wackernagel's Law particle *hí* far to the right in b, the verb complex *abhí hí pramandúḥ* must have domain over the entire hemistich, with *mā* in 2nd pos. in pāda a serving as its object. As often, when a preverb stays with its verb at the end of a clause rather than moving to the front of its clause, *hí* is inserted, between preverb and verb (or here preverb$_1$ and preverb$_2$ verb).

VII.33.2: In this vs. the perspective and location shifts from Indra, at the competing sacrifice announcing his intention to go to the Vasiṣṭhas, to the Vasiṣṭhas at their place of sacrifice "leading" Indra to them. The vss. are linked by *dūrā́t* 'from a distance' (1d, 2a), in 1d referring to the distant location of the Vasiṣṭha from Indra's point of view, in 2a the distant location of Indra from that of the Vasiṣṭhas.

With Old, I consider Pāśadyumna Vāyata the hapless sacrificer whom Indra deserted in favor of the Vasiṣṭhas. But I do not follow Old in thinking that b describes an intermediate place on Indra's journey from PV to the Vasiṣṭhas.

VII.33.3: With this vs. we pass to the Ten Kings Battle and the Vasiṣṭhas' crucial efforts in securing Indra's aid for Sudās. The emphatic repeated opening of the first three pādas *evén nú kam* highlights the critical incidents. The two sequences *evéd* and *nú kam* are both found fairly frequently elsewhere, but never elsewhere together, so it's difficult to judge the force of their combination.

VII.33.4: Ge appears to be right that this vs. is also Indra's speech. He picks up the *bráhmaṇā vaḥ* from 3d in pāda a and also addresses them as 'superior men' (voc. *naraḥ*), just as he spoke about the superior men (acc. *nṝ́n*) in 1c.

Ge takes *pitṝ́ṇā́m* with both *júṣṭī* and *bráhmaṇā*; I doubt the first, as does Old. Since I think Indra is addressing the Vasiṣṭhas at the time of the battle, not a younger generation of Vasiṣṭhas long after the battle, his "by reason of your fathers' sacred formulation" (*bráhmaṇā vo pitṝ́ṇā́m*) must refer to the formulation they inherited from their own poetic forebears and are putting to use in enlisting Indra's help.

The action Indra performs in response to the Vasiṣṭhas' employment of the *bráhman-* is not altogether clear. (Old, after some speculation, concludes "'ich komme hier nicht zur Klarheit.") The bare phrasing *ákṣam avyayam* must mean literally "I enveloped the/an axle," but whose axle it is and whether the enveloping is a help or a hindrance aren't recoverable from context. However, as Old points out, III.53.19 may provide some guidance. That vs. is addressed to an axle (voc. *ákṣa*) in a series of vss. (17–20) mean to avert possible disasters that might afflict a team of oxen and the vehicle they are pulling. In vs. 19 the axle is urged *abhí vyayasva khadirásya sā́ram* "Engird yourself in the hardwood of the Acacia tree," before being told to be and stay firm (*vīḷáyasva*). The first instruction to the axle contains the verb (*abhí*) √*vyā* 'envelop, engird', which I take as referring to fixing the ends of the axle firmly in the wheel hubs till the ends are literally surrounded with / enveloped in the wood of the wheel hub. If the same type of action is referred to here, Indra is performing a positive action, presumably securing the axle of the Vasiṣṭhas or their allies in position, to protect them and their chariot from harm, as Indra promises with *ná kílā riṣātha*.

As Ge points out (n. 4c), *śákvarī-* is the name of a meter with martial associations. As he also points out, this fairly rare meter is found in the first three vss. of X.133, a

hymn to Indra attributed to Sudās Paijavana, that is, the royal hero of the Ten Kings Battle, though there is no particular ref. to that battle in X.133. Since *śákvarīṣu* is plural here, it would be better tr. "in Sakvarī (verses)" than "in Śakvarī (meter)," as in the publ. tr.

VII.33.5: For the very compressed simile of the thirsty and heaven, cf. V.57.1 *tṛṣṇáje ná divá útsā udanyáve* "like the well-spring of heaven for a thirsty man seeking water," where the "water" part is made clear.

VII.33.6: It is a curious, but perhaps coincidental, fact that the sole occurrence of *daṇḍá-* in the RV is found in the same hymn with the only occurrence of the vṛddhi deriv. *maitrāvaruṇá-* (vs. 11), given that the *daṇḍa-* 'staff' is the emblem of office associated with the Maitrāvaruṇa priest in śrauta ritual. See Minkowski, *Priesthood in Ancient India,* pp. 141–54 and passim. The conjunction in our hymn was pointed out to me by Elizabeth Tucker.

The addition of the pejorative and sometimes diminutive suffix *-ka-* on a word already meaning 'small' -- *arbha-ká-* -- is a nice slangy touch.

In c the *ca* appears to be subordinating (so also Klein, DGRV I.242–43), though because *ábhavat* is pāda-initial, its accent need not be due to subordination.

VII.33.7: For the riddles here, see publ. intro. I make no effort at a definitive solution (or even any solution at all). In this abstention I follow the good example of Old.

VII.33.9: On the weaving, see publ. intro. and vs. 12c, as well as comm. ad vs. 14.

VII.33.10–13: Old discusses Vasiṣṭha's two births and suggests that they are presented in reverse chronological order. The birth depicted in vs. 10 is the second birth, while 11–13 treat the first. In the first birth Mitra and Varuṇa emit semen at a Sattra, which falls into a pot and ultimately gives rise to the seer Agastya. But a drop of this semen is taken into a lotus, somehow comes to the Apsaras Urvaśī, who somehow conceives and gives birth to Vasiṣṭha "from mind." In the second birth the wondrously conceived divine being of the 1st birth is received into a human Gotra. Old is uncertain about the details; I am even more uncertain.

VII.33.10: In III.51.4 I take *sám √hā* as 'compact oneself together', that is, 'concentrate one's essence', and that seems the image here, of the embryonic Vasiṣṭha taking shape from concentrated lightning. Ge (n. 10a) suggests rather that it refers to semen suddenly poured out. I do not see this, and his suggested parallel in X.95.10 seems irrelevant, esp. since the lightning there is Urvaśī.

Old's argument that vs. 10 depicts one birth and the following vss. another depends in part on taking the two *utá*'s of 10c and 11a as marking the two births. This would be more convincing if the first *utá* were not in the middle of the pāda. This position seems better accounted for by assuming that 10c refers to both births, with *utá* conjoining *tát te jánma* and *ékam*, as Ge takes it ("das war deine (eine) Geburt and eine ..."). So also Klein (DGRV I.368). The double *yád* in b and d support this interpr., with each *yád* introducing one of the births. I follow this general interpr.

The *yád* in b is very deep in its clause, with both subj. and obj. preceding it, if pādas ab form a single clause as in the standard tr. (incl. Ge and the publ. tr.). It would, however, be possible to take pāda a as the main clause on which b is dependent: "light was compacting out of lightning when M+V looked upon you." This would solve the problem, but the unusual position of *yád* could also be attributed to an attempt to make b and d parallel, each recounting one of the births and opening with the putative father (or fathers) followed by *yád*, with a preterital verb and the obj. *tvā* (the latter in different orders): b *mitrā́váruṇā yád ápaśyatāṃ tvā* and d *agástyo yát tvā viśá ājabhā́ra*. In this scenario, pāda a, which is a single NP, would have been fronted around the core clause.

With Old (fld. by Ge), I read dat. *viśé* contra Pp. *viśáḥ*. The clan in question is supposed to be the Tṛtsus.

VII.33.11: The pub. tr. reads "born from her mind," but given the uncertainties of this birth story, the mind need not be Urvaśī's, but someone else's, or even pure mind. So it might be better rendered as "born from mind."

On the semen (if that's what the drop is) and the lotus, see disc. ad vss. 10–13. If the underlying narrative really does involve transporting spilled semen in a leaf and long-distance conception therefrom, it anticipates the MBh narrative in which the king Vasu ejaculates while hunting, catches the semen in a leaf, and tries to send it home to his wife Girikā by enlisting a bird, though the bird and the semen meet with a disaster over water that leads to the semen impregnating a fish (MBh I.57.35ff.).

I take *drapsáṃ skannám* as a nominal clause, rather than taking cd as a single clause with *drapsáṃ skannám* coreferential with *tvā*.

VII.33.12: As Ge points out (n. 12a), *praketá-* is otherwise only a noun, and so it is best to go against the Pp's reading *praketáḥ* in favor of the loc. *praketé*. (Ge also entertains the possibility of reading **sapraketáḥ*.)

The "both" are presumably both births; so Ge.

The weaving in pāda c is repeated almost verbatim from 9c, but with the single Vasiṣṭha, not the pl. Vasiṣṭhas as subject. As noted in the publ. intro., I assume that this refers to the production of the sacrifice. See comm. ad vs. 14 below.

The hapax *sádāna-* is not entirely clear. Ge suggests that it stands for **sádādāna-* by haplology and tr. "der ... immerdar Geschenke hat." He does not render the *utá vā*, implicitly taking *sahásradānaḥ ... sádānaḥ* as appositive adjectives. Klein (DGRV II.169) follows Ge's interpr. of *sádānaḥ* without mentioning the possible haplology and states that the conjoined terms in the phrase *sahásradana utá vā sádānaḥ* "come close to being synonymous." His tr. "having a thousand gifts or having constant gifts" both illustrates this suggestion and shows how flat-footed such a phrase would be. Old discusses without coming to a conclusion, though he does reject the haplology explan., which goes back to Ludwig. My own interpr. takes the text as given and interprets the second adj. as additive "and one gift (more)," with *sádāna-* 'with (a) gift' standing for 'with one gift'. If the *utá vā* should be read as disjunctive 'or' (as I admit it should), perhaps this is instead a version of the Archilochus fox-and-hedgehog dichotomy ("the fox knows many things, but the hedgehog one big one") -- hence "having a thousand gifts -- or one (big) gift." This in fact is now my preferred tr. What the gifts refer to I have no idea.

VII.33.13: This vs. is the basis of Old's (and others') reconstruction of the 1st birth of Vasiṣṭha (see comm. add vss. 10–13), with Mitra and Varuṇa at a Sattra emitting semen into a pot, which then gave rise to both Agastya and Vasiṣṭha. Unfortunately the details of this vs. are far from clear, though pāda b does (fairly) straightforwardly depict a dual entity pouring semen into a pot.

The gravest problems are in pāda a. The opening *satré ha* is interpr. by Sāy, fld. by Ge., as standing for *sattré* 'at a Sattra'. The single *-t-* versus double *-tt-* before *-r-* is of course not a problem [Max Müller's ed. in fact prints *sattré*], but it *is* the case that, though the word *sat(t)rá-* and its ritual complex are well attested already in Saṃhitā prose, the word is not found elsewhere in the RV. (However, the ritual almost surely already existed; there seems a clear reference to it in vs. 9 of the Indra hymn III.31, where the Aṅgirases "sit a sitting" [*sádanam √sad*, though with the words not in the same VP] to open the Vala cave. See comm. ad loc.) However, Gr suggests reading **satréhá* instead, to be analyzed as the adv. *satrā́* 'entirely' and *ihá* 'here'; the only change required would be accenting the second word. Old sits on the fence, but seems weakly to favor the Sattra interpr., as do I, since it at least provides richer semantics and a ritual context for the actions. Moreover the particle *ha* would exactly match the same particle in the same location in pāda c.

The next problem is *jātaú*. If it is a dual ppl. (rather than a loc. sg. to the putative stem *jātí-*, which, however, is not found in the RV), it can of course modify the dual subjects of the verb *siṣicathuḥ*, and it is also quite possible that that dual subject is Mitra and Varuṇa, as Old and Ge interpr. it. The problem is thus not syntactic but semantic. In what way would M+V be "born" at a Sattra? Ge elides the problem by (as far as I can see) folding it into an anodyne phrase with *iṣitā́*, rendered as "erregt geworden," where I assume the 'geworden' is a bleached, auxiliary-like version of *jātaú*. Sāy glosses it as *dīkṣitau*, and this might nicely reflect the middle Vedic configuration of the *dīkṣā* of a soma sacrificer as tantamount to a second birth. No forms of the (secondary) root *√dīkṣ* are found in the RV; however, both *dīkṣā́-* and *dīkṣitá-* are attested in the AV, with the former fairly common. I therefore am inclined to follow Sāy's interpr. -- or what I assume Sāy's interpr. rests on -- that *jātaú* refers to the conceptual rebirth of a consecrated sacrificer. This rebirth would be somewhat comparable to the two births of Vasiṣṭha himself. This interpr. of *jātaú* would be more clearly expressed than in the publ. tr. by rendering it "(re)born [=consecrated] at a (ritual) Session."

Pāda c appears to describe the creation of Agastya (see comm. above ad vss. 10–13). Māna is the name of Agastya's father and family or indeed of Agastya himself. See Mayrhofer PN s.v. for reff.

Kü (99, 570) has a very diff. interpr. of the vs. In the first hemistich he takes *kumbhé* as a dual, modified by the dual ppl. in pāda a and subject of the dual verb in b: "Beim Somaopfer geboren, angetrieben durch Verehrungen haben die beiden Krüge den gemeinsamen Samen ergossen" (99). This is grammatically impossible, because *kumbhá-* is masc., as the two occurrences of the acc. pl. *kumbhā́n* show, and so its dual should be **kumbhā́(u)*. In c he takes *mā́naḥ* as 'house': "Mitten daraus ist ein Haus hervorgegangen" (99=570). He does not comment on the mythological content of the vs., but though *mā́na-* 'building, house' is at least marginally attested in the RV (clearest in

VII.88.5), the creation of a house from semen would be such an outlandish feat that the creation of a seer seems positively plausible.

In b the pf. *siṣicatuḥ* has a retroflexed root init., as we would expect. But the other two forms of the pf. in the RV (*sisicuḥ* II.24.4 and *sisice* III.32.15) do not. I have no explanation for the discrepancy.

VII.33.14: As Ge (n. 14) points out, this vs. seems to pick up 10d, describing the second "birth" of Vasiṣṭha, when Agastya presents him to the clan, and it seems to consist of Agastya's direct speech. As Old points out, the first hemistich seems to identify the three priests of śrauta ritual, though not by title: the Hotar, supporter of the *ukthá-*; the Udgātar, supporter of the *sā́man-*; and the Adhvaryu, supporter of the pressing stone, i.e., the one who performs the physical actions. Assuming this is the case makes it reasonably likely that the weaving of "the covering stretched by Yama" (9c, 12c) does indeed refer to the production of the sacrifice. Vasiṣṭha is thus presented as responsible for the whole of the sacrifice, not just a portion of it.

VII.34 All Gods

Re characterizes this hymn as "invitation without praise."

The first 21 (or actually 20 and a half) vss. of this 25-vs. hymn are in Dvipadā meter. Despite its name, this meter should be considered to consist of *four* pādas of 5 syllables each, since verbs located in the 6th syllable of a putative 10-syl. pāda are generally accented (see 3b, d, 4b, 6b, 20d); however, consider 14d, 17d, where verbs in that position are unaccented. Those two violations fall in the latter part of the Dvipadā portion and may be beginning the transition to Triṣṭubh, which takes over in the 2nd half of vs. 21. On the meter see Old, Prol. 95–98.

VII.34.1: HvN's resolution of the sandhi and accentuation of Saṃhitā *śukraítu* in pāda a as *śukra étu* is incorrect: the Pp rightly reads *śukrā́ etu*.

The reference to the departure of our well-crafted *manīṣā́* is a fitting beginning to a hymn, as describing the dispatch of the praise hymn to the targeted divinities.

VII.34.2: Ge (n. 2a), flg. Sāy., takes the waters as subj. of *vidúḥ* and suggests that the point is that the waters are older even than Heaven and Earth: they are the Urelement. They therefore were around for the creation of H+E and know all about it. In the absence of any other obvious subject, this seems reasonable.

In the 2nd hemistich the function and position of *ádha* are somewhat puzzling. Klein (DGRV II.96 n. 23) lists it with passages with the "logical conjunctive value" 'therefore'. But he does not tr. it or comment on its non-clause-init. position, and I find it difficult to wring a 'therefore' sense out of it. In the Prol. (369 n. 1) Old suggests that the PB parallel (I.2.9, VI.6.17) with the reading *adhaḥ* 'below' is correct and the RV should be emended, but he essentially drops that idea in the Noten, remarking that RV *ádha* is "tadellos" and that the emendation would also require altering the accent (to *adhā́ḥ*). Our passage is reminiscent of IV.17.10 *ayáṃ śṛṇve ádha jáyann utá ghnán*, which I tr. "this one is famed for conquering and smiting." Both passages have a mid-clause *ádha* that introduces a pres. participle or participles and both contain a form of √*śru*. See comm. ad IV.17.10. In both cases I think *ádha* opens a mini-clause that modifies or expands on the

main verb. In our passage I think the point is that, though rivers are very noisy when they flow (as is often emphasized in Vedic texts), these waters also know how to listen. Note also that in our case *ádha* is pāda-initial, though not clause-initial.

VII.34.3: As noted in the introductory remarks above, both *pínvanta* and *máṃsante* are accented because they open 5-syl. pādas.

Both Ge and Re take the (soma) sacrifice as the referent of *asmai*, contra both Sāy. and Old, who supply Indra instead. I definitely side with the latter. Like many All God hymns, the separate vss. can serve as little riddles, each pointing to a different god,, and the mention of *vṛtréṣu* '(battles against) obstacles', even in the plural, seems a tip-off that Indra is lurking.

I'm not quite sure what the subjunctive *máṃsante* is meant to convey -- perhaps that in times to come poets will talk about them that way in the accounts of the Vṛtra-slaying?

VII.34.4–6: Note the chiasmic verb sequence 4b *dádhāta* [... 5a *sthāta*] ... 5d *tmánā hinota* ... 6ab *tmánā ... hinóta* ... 6c *dádhāta*, with one interruption.

VII.34.4: The 2nd pl. subj. of *dádhāta* is unspecified, but is probably the priests / poets associated with the current sacrifice, who were referred to in the 1st pl. *asmát* in vs. 1. See vss. 5–6, where this identification is more explicit.

Once again both Ge and Re take *asmai* as referring to the sacrifice. They also take the nominative(s) of the 2nd hemistich as coreferential with the subj. of the impv. *dádhāta* in a: in other words, "put the horses to the chariot pole, as Indra (does/did)." This seems unnec. Old's view that the *asmai* refers to Savitar, who is then the subj. of the 2nd hemistich, is far more plausible. Although *híraṇya-bāhu-* is found only here in the RV, the very similar *híraṇya-pāṇi-* 'having gold hands' is used a number of times of Savitar, and the uncompounded phrase *bāhū́ ... hiraṇyáyā* is used of Savitar's arms in nearby VII.45.2 (also VI.71.1, 5), as Old points out. Since Tvaṣṭar fashions the mace for Indra in I.32.2, calling him *vajrín-* here is perfectly sensible.

VII.34.5–6: The 2nd pl. impvs. in these two vss., 5a *abhí prá sthāta*, 5d *hinota*, 6b *hinóta*, 6c *dádhāta*, all take the sacrifice (*yajñám*, explicitly 5b, 6b) as object and make the identification of the subject as the priests/poets, suggested ad vs. 4, more likely.

VII.34.5: The simile *áheva*, despite Pp *áha iva*, is surely to be analyzed as *áhā iva*, as Old indicates, pointing out that in other places where it occurs (e.g., IV.33.6) the Pp. gives the long vowel form. Both Old and Ge take *áhā* as nom.: "set out on the sacrifice, as the days (do [=follow one after the other])." Re takes it as acc., supplying "as (the sun) does the days," which requires that he make the verb *abhí prá sthāta* transitive ("mettez en marche"), which is unlikely. I prefer to take it as acc. extent of time, meaning something like "'keep going in the performance of sacrifice, as one keeps going day after day."

VII.34.7: Like vss. 3 and 4, this contains an unaccented oblique form of *ayám*, in this case *asya*, and as with those vss., I think it likely that *asya* is the sign of a riddling

mention of a god -- in this case likely Agni, as Old tentatively suggests. Ge and Re also see a reference to the offering fire.

I do not understand the simile in the 2nd hemistich. If the *bhū́ma* that the earth bears is its surface, what would an equivalent burden be for the offering fire?

In order to get 2 Dvipadā pādas in the 2nd hemistich, we must read **pṛthvī́* for *pṛthivī́*, as Old points out. Otherwise we have a Triṣṭubh anticipating the switch to Triṣṭubh that happens much later in the hymn.

VII.34.8: Old asserts that *áyātu-* is a determin. cmpd., not a bahuvrīhi, thus 'non-sorcerer' rather than 'not having sorcery/sorcerer'. The publ. tr. reflects -- and indeed reflects somewhat loosely -- a bahuvrīhi interpr., though I think the difference is minor. Re also takes it as a b.v.: "sans (user de) sorcellerie" (tr. EVP V), "sans user de procédés magiques" (comm., EVP IV); see also Wh n. ad AV tr. VIII.4.16. Nonetheless, a determin. interpr. is a reasonable alternative: "I -- no sorcerer -- invoke the gods." A 2nd RVic occurrence of this stem, acc. *áyātum* in VII.104.16, with AVŚ+P repetitions, is not registered in Gr., which omission is probably responsible for Re's erroneously calling our occurrence a hapax in his comm. Unfortunately this other occurrence does not resolve the question of cmpd type. The cmpd. is not disc. in AiG.

Presumably the implied opposition in this vs. is between sorcery in the 1st half-vs. and truth (*ṛtá-*) of the 2nd half. So also Re (comm.).

VII.34.9: Once again the unspecified 2nd pl. subj. should be the priests/poets.

Note the extreme alliteration of ... *devī́ṃ dhíyaṃ dadhidhvam*.

The morphological identity of this last form, *dadhidhvam*, can be queried. The three occurrences of this form are normally assigned to the perfect rather than the redupl. pres. (see esp. Kü 275), on the grounds that the *-i-*liaison is proper to the perfect. Yet no corresponding med. 2nd pl. impv. is built to the pres. stem; indeed, the posited correspondent (cf. Whitney, Gr. §668), the monstrous **dhaddhvam*, is not attested in Vedic (as imperative, injunctive, or augmented imperfect). It is likely, therefore, that *dadhidhvam* serves as impv. to both pf. and redupl. pres., neutralizing the distinction between those T/A stems. In fact, given that in this passage it is parallel to the present impv. *kṛṇudhvam* in the same vs. and immediately follows on an unambiguous redupl. pres. form to the same root and with the same obj. (8d *dhíyaṃ dadhāmi*, 9b *dhíyaṃ dadhidhvam*), a present-stem interpr. is favored. On ambig. pf. impvs. see my 2018 "The Vedic Perfect Imperative" (Fs. Lubotsky).

VII.34.10–11: After several vss. with a ritual, priestly focus, we return to the semi-riddling listing of gods, with these two vss. devoted to Varuṇa. In 10 the subj. Varuṇa is withheld till the 2nd half, thereby producing a quickly solved riddle. Vs. 11 does not name him at all, but the referent is clear from the phraseology, as well as the previous vs.

VII.34.10: The easiest thing to do with fem. gen. pl. *āsām* is to have it modify fem. gen. pl. *nadī́nām*, as Ge and Re do (e.g., "de ces rivières"). But it is unaccented and therefore should be a pronominal demonstrative, rather than an adjectival one. I therefore assume that it picks up the waters (*ā́paḥ*) earlier in the hymn (2c, 3a); the connection of Varuṇa with the waters, though not as firm in the RV as it is later, would evoke them. The rivers

are then in apposition to these unnamed waters. Re in his comm. notes the "lien" of *āsām* with *ắpaḥ* earlier in the hymn but seems to stop short of syntactically separating *āsām* from the rivers in this vs. For further disc. see comm. ad I.68.7.

VII.34.12–13: The 2nd pl. subjects of all the verbs but *vy ètu* in 13a must be the gods in general. The priests/poets who were previously unspecified 2nd pl. subjects do not command the powers to carry out the desires specified.

VII.34.12: The hapax *ádyu-* has been variously analyzed and rendered: e.g., Sāy. *adīpti-* 'non-shining', reflected in Gr's 'glanzlos' and probably Re's 'sans éclat'; Old 'excluded from heaven'. But Ge's (n. 12b) comparison of Old Avestan *aidiiu-* (YH 2x, plus a YA rep.) 'harmless' is surely correct and is accepted by EWA, etc. For disc., with earlier lit., see Narten, YH 280–81.

Our half-verse *ádyuṃ kṛṇota śáṃsaṃ ninitsóḥ* is nearly identical to VII.25.2c *āré táṃ śáṃsaṃ kṛṇuhi ninitsóḥ*, though in a different meter (our two 5-syl. pādas of Dvipadā versus Triṣṭubh). To accommodate the meter the verb and object had to be flipped and a different predicate supplied. This metrically driven modification procedure is instructive.

VII.34.14: Initial injunc. 3rd sg. *-iṣ*-aor. *ávīn* (for *ávīt*) matches the init. *áviṣṭa* (+*u*) of 12a, which I (and the standard tr.) take as a 2nd pl. *-iṣ*-aor. impv. Re. takes *ávīt* here as hortatory/imperatival ("Qu'Agni favorise ..."), but I see no problem in having a preterital (or perhaps general present "Agni aids ...") injunc. form in this vs. characterizing an individual god. The 2nd pl. is found in the hortatory address to the gods in general, parallel to impv. *kṛṇota* in 12c, whereas *ávīt* is followed by an augmented pass. aor. *adhāyi*, expressing the reciprocal human action in response to the god's help.

The first half-vs. contains two exx. of *-t/d* → *-n* sandhi before nasal: (*ávīt* →) *ávīn no* and (*havyắd* →) *havyắn námobhiḥ*. Re renders the latter as if it were an acc. pl. to *havyá-* ("... favorise nos oblations"), but this must be an example of a hasty Homeric nod, since *havyá-* 'oblation' is always neut.

Whose *námobhiḥ*? Ge takes them as Agni's, which he offers to the gods. I think it more likely that it refers to *our* acts of reverence to Agni, to which he reciprocates by aiding us. So also Scar (40: "durch {unsere} Ehrerbietungen"). Re takes *námobhiḥ* with the following clause: "Avec hommages a été déposée ... la louange ..."). This avoids the problem and works well semantically, but in this hymn verses regularly fall into two clauses separated by the half-vs. boundary, and there are no examples of a portion of b adjoined to the clause of cd.

VII.34.15: Here the 2nd pl. address appears to be to the priests/poets.

This is the one of the few vss. in which the half-vs. break does not coincide with a major syntactic break, and this is made more noticeable by the fact that there is a clause break between pādas c and d.

VII.34.16: Assuming that it is the serpent that is sitting in the depths, that is, that the referent is Ahi Budhnya, who is found explicitly in vs. 17, I see no alternative to taking the nom. sg. pres. part. *sīdan* as the predicate of a nominal sentence in cd, picking up the acc. obj. *abjắm ...áhim* in ab. Sāy. simply indicates that *sīdan* is for acc. *sīdantam*, and

Ge and Re tr. cd as it if were a rel. cl. (e.g., "qui siège ..."), a translational choice that blurs the Sanskrit. The alternative, which unifies the syntax at the expense of the sense, is to take *sī́dan* as implicitly modifying the 1st sg. subj. of *gṛṇīṣe* 'I will sing' in the first hemistich. So Scar (134): "... Den wassergeborenen Drachen preise ich ..., {ihn}, der auf dem Grund der Flüsse weilt, wenn ich im Finstern sitze," construing c (*budhné nadī́nām*) with the acc. serpent of ab and d (*rájassu ṣī́dan*) with the 1st sg. subj. This interpr. seems highly unlikely: why would the poet "I" be sitting in the darkness? and where does Scar get the "weilt" for the serpent?

I do not understand the reason for the close sandhi of *rájassu ṣī́dan*.

VII.34.17: The first half vs. is also found in V.41.16, and in both places it is metrically anomalous. Here it has the requisite 10 syllables for Dvipadā, but the caesura/pāda break comes after the 4th syllable, so that it does not fall into two 5-syl pādas. In V.41.16 (which, with the following vs. 17, is metrically different from the Triṣṭubhs that make up the bulk of that hymn) it has 10 syllables, rather than the expected 11. It is also somewhat striking that two vss. in our hymn are devoted to the very minor divinity Ahi Budhnya, when far more important gods receive only one, and I wonder if 17 hasn't been inserted to make the identification of this divinity clearer, since vs. 16 does not give him his full title. It is worth noting that our 17cd was already flagged above as one of the few places in the hymn in which a verb beginning the d pāda is not accented. This may provide further support for the idea that the vs. is a later insertion.

VII.34.18: The nom. pl. subjects of the two half vss. are different, in my opinion. The loc. 'men', recipients of the fame bestowed on them by (presumably) gods in ab, are the ones who go forth for wealth in cd.

The phase *śárdhanto aryáḥ* has an almost identical correspondent in nearby VII.21.5 *sá śardhad aryó víṣuṇasya jantóḥ*, where the second phrase shows (or at least strongly suggests) that *aryáḥ* is gen. sg. On the phrase see Thieme (Fremdling 54–55).

VII.34.19: My tr. "the worlds" assumes that *bhū́mā* is pl., contrary to the standard, who tr. "the earth." I would be happy with the latter.

I have taken *-senā-* as 'weapon' here, but it could as well be 'army', with Ge, Re, etc. It does not affect the sense appreciably.

VII.34.20: The pl. "wives" (*pátnīḥ*), as often in the RV, must refer to the Wives of the Gods. As I have argued elsewhere ("'Sacrificer's Wife' in the Rig Veda: Ritual Innovation?" 2018 in Proceedings of the 13th World Skt. Conf., 2006), one of the models for the introduction of the Sacrificer's Wife (*pátnī*) in Vedic ritual, beginning in the late RV, is the presence of the Wives of the Gods on the ritual ground, as here. Tvaṣṭar is their usual companion and chaperone. He is also associated with the shaping of the embryo in the womb, as in the pregnancy charm X.184.1. The request that he confer heroes on us here must be a prayer for sons (who will become) heroes.

The 3rd pl. verb *gámanti* is classifed by Wh (Roots) as a them. present, to a stem not otherwise found (at least in the RV). Macd's identification (VGS, verb list) as a root aor. subjunctive is surely correct. Although grammars give the 3rd pl. act. subj. ending only as sec. *-an*, it does not seem to me that the Sprachgefühl for this part of the paradigm

is terribly strong, and it is easy to imagine extending the 3rd *singular* choice between sec. *-at* and prim. *-ati* to the 3rd pl. For a similar case see *karanti* in X.48.7, which Wh identifies as a root pres. form.

VII.34.21: As noted above, the first hemistich contains 10 syllables falling into two 5-syllable pādas, but the second half is a straight Triṣṭubh, anticipating the Triṣṭubhs of the rest of the hymn.

The stem *vasūyú-* can modify both masc. and, as here, fem. nouns. This exact phrase, *arámatir vasūyúḥ* is also found at VII.1.6.

VII.34.23: Both Ge and Re take *rā́yaḥ* here as nom. sg., parallel to the other entities like mountains and waters, but I do not see why the construction that ends vs. 22, *ví dadhātu rā́yaḥ* "let him apportion wealth," is not simply continued here. There *rā́yaḥ* must be the obj. of the verb, whether acc. pl. or partitive gen. sg.; in either case the preferred accent would be *rāyáḥ*, but there are enough forms with the opposite accent that we need not be too troubled. If we can accept the wrong accent in 22d, I see no reason not to do so in 23a. Re gestures towards my interpr. in his n.

VII.34.24: Note the izafe-like *yé sahā́saḥ* nominal relative clause.

Correctly accented gen. sg. *rāyáḥ* appears here; see comm. on vss. 22–23.

On the infinitive construction here, see Keydana, Infinitive im Ṛgveda, 70, 159.

VII.34.25: I do not understand why Ge and Re render the *juṣanta*, to the common and well-understood medial stem *juṣáte* 'enjoys', as 'grant' (zibilligen) and 'agree' respectively. Although it is true that the final vss. of hymns frequently ask gods for things, it is also true that we commend our praises to them -- and surely that's what's going on here: we want the gods to take pleasure in the hymn, or the ritual in general, that we have just offered them.

VII.35 All Gods

As indicated in the publ. intro., this hymn is remarkably monotonous and has no real content -- simply the unbroken repetition of the wish that various gods or natural elements "be luck" (*śám*) for us. It therefore needs and deserves very little comment. Besides the deities mentioned in each vs., what variety there is in the hymn is found in the adjuncts associated with each one, often a characterizing adjective (e.g., 1b) or an oblique case form expressing accompaniment (e.g., 1a) or circumstance (e.g., 1d). The 1st 13 vss. follow a fairly rigid template: # *śáṃ (naḥ)* GOD NAME (ADJUNCT) ("BE") (with the latter expressed by a 3rd ps. impv. of √*bhū* or √*as*, or gapped; there seems no functional difference between √*as* and √*bhū* in this hymn). The order of adjunct and "be" can be flipped. Sometimes a single god (or god pair) occupies a pāda; sometimes two separate *śám* clauses are found in a pāda. In the former case, the adjuncts fill the extra space, while in the latter case the god/power name is all there is room for. In a few cases, noted below, the pattern is broken by the substitution of a verb other than 'be'.

VII.35.1: This gods listed in this vs. are dual divinities, each with Indra as the first part of the pair and all expressed in dual dvandvas. All have the expected double accent except

indrāgnî in pāda a, which always lacks an accent on the first member in its numerous occurrences. Re suggests this is because the putative dual ending on **índrā-* is not perceived because of its coalescence with the initial vowel of *agnî*. This is fairly plausible, though there are a number of instances where the word must be read with four syllables and there the dual ending of the 1st member should have been recoverable. For further on the distracted reading, see comm. ad X.65.2.

VII.35.2: In a and c the provider of luck is *śáṃsaḥ* 'Laud', a clear play on the ubiquitous *śám*. In c *śáṃsaḥ* is the head of a NP with dependent gen.: *satyásya suyámasya*.

In d Ge renders *purujātáḥ* as "der viele Nachkommen hat," but given the form of this cmpd., this can hardly be correct. Cmpds. of the shape *puru*-PAST PPL (+ACCENT), like frequent *puru-ṣṭutá-*, *puru-hutá-*, mean 'much Xed' or 'Xed by many', and in cmpds. with *jāta-* as 2nd member, *-jāta-* means 'born, generated' not 'offspring'. Re, who tr. "aux nombreuses naissances," suggests that Aryaman is so qualified because of his association with marriage.

VII.35.3: Although sg. fem. *urūcî* is not otherwise used of the earth in its 5 other occurrences, the du. modifies *ródasī* in VI.11.4 (and at some distance in IV.56.4), which supports Ge's supplying of Earth here.

The well-attested adj. *suháva-* almost always modifies a god or gods and means 'easy to invoke'. Ge supplies 'names' here, and I follow him: "god X, easy to invoke" and "the name of god X, easy to invoke" are functionally nearly identical. And in X.39.1 *pitúr ná nāma suhávam* "(the chariot), easy to invoke like the name of one's father," we have the posited phrase, though "name" is in a simile. Re rejects this interpr. in favor of a nominalized *suháva-* "les appels propices (faits) aux dieux," with, in my opinion, insufficient reason.

VII.35.4: The relentless pattern "luck be" is briefly broken here in pāda d, with *śám* the object of the verb 'blow' (*śám ... abhí vātu*).

VII.35.5: Ge takes b as another break in the pattern: "Das Luftreich soll uns Glück sehen lassen," with *śám* the object of the inf. *dṛśáye*. But this seems unlikely: the clause is easy to interpret within the template, and furthermore the periphrastic causative assumed by his tr. would be awkwardly or impossibly expressed (lit. "let the Midspace be for us to see luck"); to express such a meaning we would expect rather a form of √*kṛ* ("let the Midspace make us to see luck").

VII.35.6: The last pāda here again has a real verb 'let hear' (*śṛṇotu*), not simply 'be', and *śám* is thus displaced from predicated nominative ("X be luck") to adverbial usage ("for luck"), with *naḥ* correspondingly promoted from dative ("for us") to acc. obj. of the verb ("hear us"). Note that this same construction might be found in pāda b and c, which lack verbs, while pāda a must follow the usual pattern because of its *astu*. Thus bc possibly, "let Varuṇa ... (hear us); let Rudra ... (hear) us." However, I think it likely that b+c simply follow a. In any case it's striking (or at least striking in a hymn that otherwise has so little variation) that the verbal construction changes within the vs., while the pattern of

personnel is rigidly fixed: each pāda contains a single god as subject with an instr. pl. of his entourage.

VII.35.8: The first pāda again has a verb with content, *úd etu* 'let go up', and as in 6d this slots *śám* into an adverbial role.

VII.35.8: *bhavítra-* is found only here in the RV. My "(the means of) Creation" gives full functional value to the instrument suffix *-tra-*. Gr "die Welt," Ge "Creatur (?)," Re "le séjour-des-existences"; see Re's n. for further, though inconclusive, disc. The immed. preceding hymn contains *janítra-* (VII.34.2), which seems to mean something similar, insofar as it's possible to tell.

VII.35.14–15: These last two vss. stand apart from the 13 monotonous vss. that precede them, though they hardly have more content.

VII.35.14: The first hemistich refers, as often, to the hymn just concluding, with particular insistence on its absolute currency in the present moment, as shown by the pres. participle and the comparative adj. 'newer': *idám bráhma kriyámānaṃ návīyaḥ* "this sacred formulation being made anew."

Who the "cow-born ones" are is debated (see, e.g., Ge, Re, and the long n. by Bl [RV Rep. 316–17]), a question I confess to finding not very interesting, perhaps because the longueurs of this hymn have dulled my senses.

The last phrase of 14, the afterthought nominal rel. cl. *utá yé yajñíyāsaḥ*, is probably meant to include all stray divinities and cosmic or natural elements that don't fall under the first three categories (heavenly, earthly, cow-born) but might deserve worship. It might be better rendered "and those (others) who are worthy of the sacrifice."

VII.35.15: The just discussed phrase in 14d *yé yajñíyāsaḥ* is picked up by 15a *yé devā́nāṃ yajñíyā yajñíyānām*. I assume that this phrase doesn't introduce another group of worthies, but is simply an intensive elaboration of the original phrase. The next pāda qualifies them with another derivative of √*yaj*, the *-tra-*stem *yájatra-*, which I interpr., somewhat capaciously, as meaning that they provide the occasion or reason for Manu's sacrifice.

VII.36 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn can be read as a progress through a sacrifice. Re (EVP IV.97) follows Hillebrandt in seeing it as a "récitation du pressurage vespéral." Hillebrandt (Myth. II.128 n. 3) in fact considers it as forming, with VII.37.1–7 and VII.38, an old śāstra for the Evening (or Third) Pressing. Although the focus on Indra and the Ṛbhus in VII.37 does identify *that* hymn as associated with the Third Pressing, I do not see that association here. The kindling of the ritual fire that climaxes our vs. 1 (d) suggests rather the Morning Pressing, as does the sun's sending out the cows in 1b (so also Ge n. 1b). Moreover, most of the gods named in our hymn are not Third Pressing gods; for example, the Maruts, mentioned twice (vss. 7 and 9) are primarily associated with the Midday Pressing, and though the Third Pressing begins with an Āditya cup (which could subsume Mitra and Varuṇa), that pair is prominent in the Morning Pressing

and are found here in vs. 2; Sūrya (vs. 1) is certainly not appropriate to the Evening Pressing. As far as I can, VII.36 and VII.37 are ritually independent.

VII.36.1: As Ge (n. 1a) and Re indicate, the opening of this hymn, with *prá bráhmaitu* (that is, *bráhma etu*), is very like the opening of nearby VII.34.1 *prá śukraítu* (=*śukrā́ etu*) ... *manīṣā́*, with both referring to the beginning of the ritual day with the dispatch of the poets' verbal offering to the gods.

Note the figure *ví ... sasṛje* (b) / *ví ... sasre* (c), both with 3rd sg. mid. perfects built to phonologically similar roots and compounded (in tmesis) with the same preverb.

Narten (1969 "Ai. *sṛ* in synchronischer und diachronischer Sicht" = Kl. Sch. 135–41) recognizes two synchronically distinct roots √*sṛ*, primarily act. 'loslaufen, eilen' and primarily med. 'sich ausstrecken'. The two forms of the med. pf. *ví sasre* (here and X.71.4) belong to the latter root; see also Kü (553). The instr. *sā́nunā* I take as idiomatic for "on her back," rather than expressing something like "along the back (of something else)." The other occurrence of the pf. *ví sasre* in X.71.4 contains an explicitly sexual image *utó tvasmai tanvàm vísasre, jāyéva pátye uśatī́ suvā́sāḥ* "And for another she [=Speech] has stretched out her body, like an eager well-dressed wife to her husband," and the same picture of feminine yielding is presumably meant here.

Re curiously takes *pṛthú prátīkam* as a "pre-compound" modifying Agni, but I follow Ge in taking it as an acc. construed with *ádhi*, a reference to the part of the earth on which the ritual fire is kindled.

VII.36.2: My publ. tr. of *bruvāṇáḥ* "when called upon" follows Thieme's (Mitra and Aryaman, p. 69), which in turn follows Meillet's ([1907] "quand il est invoqué"; see Thieme p. 40). Ge and Re both take *bruvāṇáḥ* as pass./reflex. 'be called, call oneself' with *mitráh* as predicate (e.g., "der Mitra (Freund) heisst"). I now think something halfway between is probably correct. When √*brū* is not cmpded with a preverb, it does not seem to take an acc. of addressee, so my passive version with addressee as subj., "when called upon," is probably wrong. However, I don't think it's a mere naming construction. Rather, Thieme's 1st tr. (p. 40) "Contract, when named ..." conveys the intent better: that, when the word -- and god -- alliance/Alliance is spoken at the concluding of a pact, the pact acquires its efficacy. JPB's tr. of the almost identical III.59.1 "Mitra arranges the peoples when (Alliance) is declared" cleverly plays on the ambiguity of the word *mitrá-*, and I would substitute something like that here.

VII.36.3: The general consensus, beginning with Sāy. (see also Ge, Re [by implication], Lüders 395, Oberlies RdRV II.213), is that this vs. describes the rainy season, with Parjanya as the divinity. But in a hymn with such a strong ritual focus, such a detour into meteorology would seem out of place. I think that it instead concerns soma/Soma, but, as so often, with a cosmic nimbus surrounding this ritual substance. It is, of course, a commonplace that Soma in the IXth Maṇḍala is regularly called a bull; cf. one of the many passages, with the same verb of roaring as here: IX.82.1ab ... *sómaḥ ... vṛ́ṣā ... acikradat*. The association of Soma with heaven in IX is also too ubiquitous to need demonstration, as consultation (passim) of the 2nd vol. of Oberlies's *Relig. Ṛgveda*, devoted to the Soma hymns (e.g., "Der Himmel als Heimat des Soma" [14–16]), amply demonstrates. For Soma circling "a great heavenly seat" (*máhi sádma daívyam*) see

IX.83.5. That Soma as cosmic bull *evokes* the concept of the thunderstorm, as I think this vs. does, is quite different from declaring that the vs. directly depicts the storm.

Under my interpr., the *sū́dāḥ* (for further on this word see below) that swell like milk-cows would be the soma stalks after their soaking or even the cows that provide the milk to mix with the just-pressed soma. Pāda a is more difficult to fit into this scenario. The quieting of the wind does not have an unambiguous analogue in the soma sacrifice. It could refer to the common dying of wind at evening, but this would require following Hillebrandt's view that this is an Evening Pressing hymn, a suggestion rejected above. In IX.22.2 the surging of the soma juices is compared to that of the wind, and so our passage might refer to arresting the flow of the soma when it is mixed with milk. But I do not consider this a strong suggestion and remain uncertain how to fit pāda a into the overall ritual focus.

I assign *rante* (so Pp.) to √*rā*[3] '(come to) rest' (so also Lub), along with *ranta* in I.61.11 and nearby VII.39.3, contra the various other interpr. to be found in the lit. I see no reason not to read the prim. ending *-ante* indicated by its sandhi situation and restored by the Pp., despite Lub's entry "*ranta*!," suggesting a sec. ending and injunctive form. As far as I can see this isolated stem can be as easily a root present as the root aorist identified by Lub.

The meaning of the word *sū́da-* is much disputed. It occurs three times uncompounded in the RV (here and in IX.97.44 and X.61.2), as well as once in a cmpd. *sū́da-dohas-* (VIII.69.3). Gr's 'Süssigkeit, süsser Trank', which I essentially follow, has been rejected by most comm. and tr. since, starting with Pischel, who interprets it as 'Somabeisatz', referring to the extras added to the soma. Another strain of interpr., in part dependent on post-RVic passages, takes it as referring to small bodies of standing water. For disc. and various alternate tr., see, e.g., Old, Noten II.263–64; Bloomfield, RR 101; KEWA III.493 (with fuller disc. than EWA II.740); Gotō (1st class, 342–43); Re comm. ad loc. The general opinion is that there are at two distinct words *sū́da-*. In our passsage Ge renders it as 'die Lachen' (pools) and Re as 'les mares' (ponds). While I have not investigated the post-RVic ritual passages, which may belong elsewhere, I see no reason that the RVic occurrences can't be united under one rubric. The passage in IX.97.44 refers to the preparation of soma and in fact seems almost to gloss the phrase *mádhvaḥ sū́dam pavasva* "Purify yourself into the sweetness of honey" in its pāda a by *svádasva ... pávamānaḥ* "sweeten yourself as you purify yourself." X.61.2 is an obscure mythological snippet in a hymn bristling with difficulties; I argue there (comm. ad loc.) that *sū́da-* refers to the sweet admixtures to soma, in contrast to the soma itself. The cmpd *sū́da-dohas-* in VIII.69.3 modifies cows in a passage that also treats the preparation of soma and seems to mean something like "milking out the sweetness / giving the sweetening milk"; we can compare the root-noun cmpd *havya-sū́d-* 'sweetening/preparing the oblation' (I.93.12, IV.50.5), also containing a form of *sūd* and also modifying cows, in soma-preparation context. It is esp. telling that in I.93.12 the cows are urged to 'swell' (*ā́ pyāyantām*), just as the *sū́daḥ* in our passage are compared to cows and they 'swell' (*ápīpayanta*). The only passage in the RV that might favor a 'puddle / pool / pond' interpr. is the one under disc. here, and that is because the vs. has been interpr. (wrongly in my view; see above) as referring to the thunderstorm, whereas I think it is clear that soma preparation is at issue here as well as in the other *sū́da-* passages. Though I still believe that the word is related to the 'sweet' root, my interpr. of *sū́da-* is otherwise in

line with Pischel's -- I think it likely refers to the sweetness(es) / sweet admixtures that are added to the pressed soma -- though I have not arrived at this interpr. by the same route as Pischel. Since *sū́da-* is elsewhere a noun, I would slightly alter my tr. here to "the sweetness(es) have swelled like milk-cows," though the barbarity of the plural 'sweetnesses' would preclude allowing it in the publ. tr.

VII.36.4: The construction of this vs. is skewed: the first hemistich contains a typical generalizing rel. cl. referring to proper ritual performance ("who[ever] will yoke ..."). It is couched in the 3rd sg. and contains a pres. subjunctive (*yunájat*). In the 2nd hemistich, pāda c contains another 3rd sg. rel. cl., this time with a pres. indic. (or possibly subj.) (*minā́ti*), but without a ritual focus, and pāda d contains a 1st sg. optative that does relate to the ritual (*vavṛtyā́m*). This ill-assorted trio of clauses has been variously treated. Ge thinks that both rel. clauses have gods as subject, though not necessarily the same god (see n. 4), and that at least the rel. cl. of c has *aryamáṇam* in d as referent of the rel. prn. Re, mostly flg. Sāy., takes a pious human as subject of ab and supplies a main cl. with it. I think rather that d provides the main cl. for ab, with c a distinct rel. cl. dependent on d, and that there is a switch of reference between the 3rd sg. *yáḥ ... yunájat* of the first hemistich and 1st ps. *vavṛtyām* of d: "I" am the embodiment of the proper ritual actor as defined in ab. The rel. cl. of c is quite distinct and does indeed depend on *aryáman-* in d; the god I wish to bring here to my ritual is the one who can neutralize the battle fury of my (and his) enemy. Switch of reference between 3rd ps. and 2nd ps., even within a single vs., is extremely common when referring to gods, and I see no reason why a similar switch between 3rd and 1st would not be possible when referring to the poet/ritual officiant. For a 1st ps. version of the 1st pāda, cf. I.82.6 *yunájmi te bráhmaṇā keśínā hárī* (also III.35.4, VII.19.6).

dhāyú- is a hapax. Gr glosses 'durstig', connecting it to √*dhā* 'suckle'. Old suggests, quite doubtfully, that it belongs rather to √*dhāv* 'run', and this suggestion underlies Ge's 'rennlustig'; see also AiG II.2.470, where it is explained as showing an exchange between *-v-* and *-y-*. EWA s.v. (rightly) rejects this root affiliation, in favor of one suggested by Gotō (1st Kl. 179 n. 311) to √*dhan*^{I} 'id.'. Re tr. 'riches en dons', but suggests an association with *dhā́yas-* 'nourishment, sustenance', bringing us back to Gr's and indeed Whitney's (Roots) root etym. to √*dhā* 'suckle'. My 'seeking fodder' reflects the same association.

Note the faint phonological figure of (b) *surátha śūra dhā(yu)* / d *su(k)rát(um)*.

I follow JPB (Ādityas, 171–72) in taking *aryáman-* here as a descriptor of Indra. As Brereton points out, it makes no sense for Aryaman to appear when the poet is seeking to attract Indra. Moreover, the action of pāda c, confounding battle fury, is much more appropriate for Indra (cf., e.g., nearby VII.18.16 *índro manyúm manyumyò mimāya*), who is also the most common referent for the adj. *sukrátu-* 'very resolute'.

VII.36.5: Ge and Re in their different ways attempt to wring a more palatable tr. from *yajante* than the VP should allow. The problem is that the acc. with this verb here is not a god, the usual object, but two desirable qualities of a god, namely fellowship/companionship and vitality/vigor. In Ge's rendering the reverent ones "request" these qualities (erbitten); in Re's they "obtain them by sacrifice." But though Re claims that this is the meaning of medial forms of √*yaj*, in fact uncompounded

middles take the god sacrificed to, just like active forms; cf. nearby VII.42.3 *yájasva ... devā̃n*. It is forms (both act. and mid.) compounded with *ā́* that acquire the meaning 'obtain by sacrifice'. I therefore think the abstract qualities fellowship and vitality must be the objects of our sacrifice/worship, standing in for their divine possessor.

I take *ṛtásya dhā́man* "domain of truth" as referring to the ritual ground (as does Sāy.).

Ge's tr. of *bābadhe* tentatively connects it with √*bandh* 'bind' (flg. Sāy.), not √*bādh* '(op)press' (see his n. 5c). But √*bandh* otherwise lacks a pf. in the RV and beginning in the AV its weak forms have a base *bedh*-. The standard weak 3rd sg. pf. to √*bādh* is *babādhé*; see Kü 330–31. Schaeffer (156) takes *bābadhe* as an intens. pres., parallel to *badbadhé* with both following the standard perfect in function, and Kü (331; cf. also 488) seems to follow, though he takes *badbadhé* as an intensive *perfect*, distinguished from the present *bābadhe*. Since all these stems have a 3rd sg. ending characteristic of the perfect, I consider at least *bābadhe* to be a straight perfect, with adjustment of the vowel length of redupl. and root syllable to conform better to such distribution elsewhere in the perfect system; cf. esp. *vāvṛdhé* versus *vavárdha*. The intens. *badbadhé* then adopted the inflectional patterns of the other two redupl. stems. As for what the verb means here, although *ví* √*bādh* generally has a negative sense 'thrust away (undesirable things)', here I think the same literal sense refers to the god's pushing out towards us the *pṕ́kṣaḥ* 'fortifying nourishments' we want in exchange for praise. Re (comm.) suggests a slightly different semantic pathway.

VII.36.6: According to Old and Ge, this vs. consists only of dependent clauses, and this is certainly true descriptively: there are two subordinate clauses marked by the subordinating conj. *yád* 'when' (a) and the rel. prn. *yā́ḥ* (c), one accented verb (*suṣváyanta*) in the rel. cl. of c, and no main verbs. In the publ. tr. I take d as a covert main clause, signalled only by the preverb *abhí*, with which I supply a verb of motion. However, it is perfectly possible that d is simply a continuation of the rel. cl. of c, though I do not then know what to do with the *abhí* init. in d. Under the interpr. with cd as rel. clause the 2nd hemistich would simply be "who are richly fertile, rich in milk, rich in streams, swelling with their own milk." In any case, if it lacks a main clause, the vs. cannot be attached either to preceding vs. 5 or following vs. 7; it would have to be an independent if incomplete structure.

The first hemistich lacks a finite verb, and in my view the participle *vāvaśānā́ḥ* (whether pf. or intens.; Kü 488 [and Schaeffer by omission] favor the former) serves as predicate. However, both Ge and Re supply a verb of motion, presumably on the basis of initial *ā́*: "her(kommen)" and "ar(rivent)." This is of course possible. Both Ge and Re also take the part. *vāvaśānā́ḥ* as belonging to the pf. of √*vaś* 'desire', whose participle is homonymous with that of √*vā́ś*: "zusammenverlangend" and "riches en désirs" respectively. Although this cannot be faulted formally, the well-known noise-making quality of rivers (embodied in the very word *nadī́*-) provides a more vivid image and, on the other hand, it is not clear what the rivers would be eager for.

On the near-hapax *suṣváyanta* see my *-áya*-Formations (52–53), where I argue that the other occurrence of the stem, act. part. *suṣváyantī* (X.110.6=AV V.27.8) is founded upon this passage and that the form here has been generated in the playful and alliterative context of this vs. (see esp. the following *su*- adjectives *sudúghāḥ sudhārā́ḥ*)

loosely to *suṣṻ-* 'well-bearing', a connection already suggested by Weber (see Old). Such a derivation matches the theme of the rivers' burgeoning fertility that dominates the vs.

VII.36.7: HvN's restoration of the pausal form at the end of c as *caránti* is incorrect; it must be *carántī*, as the Pp. has it.

Ge suggests that the 'imperishable' (*ákṣarā*), an esoteric designation for 'cow', is the Dakṣiṇā, while Sāy. thinks rather of Vāc. In this Marut vs. I wonder if it doesn't refer to their mother Pṛśni.

For the phrase *yújyam ... rayím* see VIII.46.19.

The nom. pl. *té* is very oddly positioned, in the middle of both clause and pāda, breaking up the NP *yújyam ... rayím*, and not even adjoining the caesura. I have no explanation.

VII.36.8: The NP *dhiyó avitāram*, characterizing Bhaga, reprises the VP *dhíyam ... avantu* in 7b, where the Maruts were the subject.

The phrase *sātaú vājam* in d is somewhat problematic. Ge takes it, without comment, as equivalent to the common *vājasya sātaú* (e.g., VII.21.7) with a genitive: "bei dem Gewinnen des Preises." Re follows, commenting "seul exemple de *sātí-* avec régime Acc." But this is the problem: although the dative inf. *sātáye* regularly takes the acc. (e.g., IX.8.2 *sātáye vásūni*), the loc. to the same stem never does. And in fact even the dative, when construed with *vāja-*, takes the gen.: *vājasya sātáye* (V.9.7, VI.60.13, IX.7.9, X.93.10). In the one apparent exception, IX.68.7 *vājam ā darṣi sātáye*, the acc. is actually object of the main verb. I therefore think that *vājam* here has to be an obj. of *prá ... kṛṇudhvam*, parallel to the divinities and semi-divinities in the vs.

VII.36.9: On *niṣikta-pā-* see Old and now Scar (306).

I take *prajāyai* as a quasi-infinitive. See also X.73.5.

VII.37 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is primarily devoted to the Ṛbhus (vss. 1–2) and Indra (vss. 3–7), which associates the hymn with the Third Pressing.

VII.37.1: The function of *abhí*, initial in c, is unclear; the verb of this hemistich, *pṛṇadhvam*, final in d, does not appear with *abhí* elsewhere.

On the triple-backed (*tripṛṣṭhá-*) soma, see Ge's n. 1c, where he suggests among other possibilities that it refers to the three ingredients making up the soma drink (soma juice, water, and milk).

VII.37.1–2: The stationing of the adj. *ámṛkta-* 'indestructible' at the end of the b pādas of both vss., in each case some distance from its noun, is clearly deliberate, but I'm not sure what it's signaling.

VII.37.3: There is some lexical chaining here: in pāda a the standing epithet of Indra, *maghavan,* picks up the pl. *maghávatsu* in 2a (in the same metrical position), thus implicitly asserting an identification of the human patrons of 2 with Indra. The quasi-inf. *deṣṇám* (trisyllabic, to be read *dayiṣṇám*), also in pāda a, echoes *dayadhvam* at the end of

vs. 2. Although *deṣṇá-* is standardly taken as a deriv. of √*dā* 'give' (so already Gr., also AiG II.2.927–28, EWA s.v. *DĀ*, II.714), it is at least secondarily associated with √*day* 'distribute' here. A more distant, and less telling, lexical echo is *pūrṇā́* 'full' with 1d *pṛṇadhvam* 'fill!'.

Note the abundance of *vásu-* forms (*vásunaḥ* b, *vásunā* c, *vasavyā́* d).

For d Ge (n. 3d) appositely cites VIII.32.15 *nákir asya ... niyantā́ sūnṛ́tānām*, which he tr. ad loc. as "Keiner tut ... seinen Gnadegaben Einhalt," with *sūnṛ́tānām* an objective gen. with *niyantā́*. I am therefore puzzled as to why he does not take *sūnṛ́tā* here as standing for acc. pl. *sūnṛ́tāḥ* in sandhi, as the obj. of *ní yamate*, the same lexeme as in VIII.32.15. Instead he follows the Pp. in taking it as nom. sg. *sūnṛ́tā*, subj. of the verb: "Deine Grossmut hält die Schätze nicht zurück" (sim. Re). My tr. takes account of VIII.32.15 and goes against the Pp.

VII.37.4: The connection of the first two vss., dedicated to the Ṛbhus, and the subsequent Indra vss. is made clear here: Indra is called *ṛbhukṣán-* (cf. the pl. applied to the Ṛbhus in 1b, 2b) in pāda a and compared with *vā́ja-* in b. Vāja is of course the name of one of the Ṛbhus, and they are all addressed as *vājāḥ* in 1b. Both Ge and Re take the simile *vā́jo ná* as containing the PN (e.g., "comme un Vāja"), though Ge allows the common noun sense as an alternate ("wie der gute Vāja [die gute Beute]"), but I think the comparison is stronger if the 'prize' sense is more prominent and the relationship to the Ṛbhu name is backgrounded. However, I would now emend the tr. to recognize the PN explicitly: "Like a prize [/like (the Ṛbhu) Vāja] ..."

Pāda b, with its description of Indra going home, is reminiscent of the envoi in the fallow-bay-yoking oblation at the end of the soma sacrifice (cf., e.g., I.82a, III.53.4-6) and is therefore appropriate to the Third Pressing context.

VII.37.5: This vs. presents minor problems of syntax and the uncertain fit of certain lexical items. In the first pāda it is not clear what the *pravátaḥ* are that Indra regularly gains for his devotee. The stem *pravát-* generally refers to a slope or sloping course. Ge takes it as an abstract Vorsprung (lead or advantage), Re as a course, Tichy (Nom.ag. 307) as "die schnellen Wege" (with !). I think the clue is found in nearby VII.32.27 *tváyā vayám pravátaḥ śáśvatīr apò 'ti śúra tarāmasi* "with you let us cross over the (river-)courses one after another, cross over the waters, o champion." Here as well the reference seems to be to Indra's aiding us in gaining new lands by crossing river after river.

As for pāda b, all three just-named scholars take *dhībhíḥ* as part of the main clause found in pāda a and embed the first part of b within this frame. Cf., e.g., Ge's "Du gewinnst selbst ... den Vorsprung ab nach den Absichten, mit denen du (etwas) unternimmst." But, though convenient, this kind of embedding is foreign to RVic sentence structure. Instead I think we must take the rel. prn. *yā́bhiḥ* as coreferential with *pravátaḥ* in the main cl. (*pravát-* being, of course, fem.). The instr. of *pravát-* generally expresses extent: 'along the slope (etc.)' (e.g., VIII.5.37=13.8=IX.24.2 *ā́po ná pravátā yatîḥ* "like waters going along a slope"), and so here I assume that Indra accomplishes his work (*víveṣaḥ*), that is, assures victory for us, along the river-courses that are being fought for. The other instr. fem. in this hemistich, *dhībhíḥ*, is then independent of *yā́bhiḥ*

and part of the rel. cl. that *yā́bhiḥ* introduces, and I take it in the same sense as the instr. *matíbhiḥ* in 2d and *dhiyā́* in 6c: "in accord with [thought/vision]."

The success of Indra's activities on our behalf is announced in c and his help duly noted. The number mismatch in the instr. phrase *yújyābhir ūtī́* is common in Triṣṭubh cadences containing inst. *ūtí-*, truncated from iambic cadences (dimeter / Jagatī) of the type ... *víśvābhir ūtíbhiḥ* (I.23.6 etc., etc.). See further disc. ad VI.10.5.

VII.37.6: The trans.-/caus. *vāsáyasi* is here used in a curious idiomatic sense. The other two occurrences of this stem, nearby each other in III.1.17, 7.3, are straightforward in function: 'cause to dwell / settle down'. But here the verb is used in a complaint: 'cause to wait, cool one's heels, hang around, bide one's time'. The idiom is reinforced by the very rare use of the simile particle *iva* with a verb. My "seem to be ..." is meant to capture this *iva*; it could also be rendered 'as it were'. Ge (n. 6) suggests that this is a hint to the poet's patron that he (the poet) has been waiting too long for his dakṣiṇā.

The adj. *tātyá-* is a transparent deriv. of the familiar word for father, *tatá-* 'daddy, papa'. I therefore think the rather formal register of Ge's väterlich and Re's paternel strike the wrong note; surely the idea is that Indra's *dhī́-* is affectionate and indulgent.

VII.37.7: The sense and syntax of this vs. are extremely challenging. My interpr. differs from those of the other standard tr. I will not treat these in detail, but will note two important points of difference. I do not think that Indra is the referent of *yám* in pāda a (as, e.g., Old does), and I do not think that *tribandhú-* in c is a PN, much less a reference to Vasiṣṭha (see, e.g., Ge, Mayr PN s.v.).

My sense of the structure of the vs. is that the two outer pādas (a, d), which match by virtue of being relative clauses introduced by *yám*, go together, with the referent of the *yám* the same in each: a mortal man beset by difficulties. These relative clauses depict the same unfortunate situation, the dissolution and isolation of this man. The two inner pādas (b, c) are the main clause (or a subordinate and a main clause in b and c respectively) and present Indra as the antidote and refuge for the unfortunate mortal. This complicates the clause relations but has the virtue of making sense (some sense, anyway). Many details remain to be discussed, however.

In pāda a the VP (*abhí yám ... ī́se*) is puzzling: √*īś* does not otherwise occur with *abhí*, and it is found overwhelmingly with a genitive, not an accusative complement. (For disc. of other possible acc. exx. cited by Gr., see comm. ad VII.32.18.) Commenting on this passage, Re suggests that √*īś* appears with the acc. only when it is a pronoun, but this is not borne out by the distribution; among other things, there are plenty of pronominal genitives with √*īś*.) Here the clue to the usage is provided by a passage in the next hymn (cited by Old), VII.38.4 *abhí yáṃ devy áditir gṛṇā́ti*, which has the identical structure, save for a different named goddess (also a *-ti*-abstract) and a different verb, *gṛṇā́ti* (against our *abhí yáṃ devy nírṛtiś cid ī́śe*). The root √*gṝ* regularly takes both *abhí* and the acc. In VII.38.4 the one referred to by *yám* is benevolently greeted by the benevolent goddess Aditi; our passage seems to have been constructed as a deliberate contrast to this happy scene, with the malevolent goddess Nirṛti extending her sway to an unfortunate mortal. (The passages differ in one notable way, however: in VII.38.4 the referent of *yám* is the god Savitar.) The pairing of the two passages accounts for the unexpected preverb and unexpected accusative with *ī́śe* in our passage.

The middle pādas referring to Indra (in my view) present the god as a sort of venerable figure with whom the beleaguered man of pāda a (and d) can take refuge. Indra's venerable status results from the years that have accumulated for him, as pāda b indicates, and in c the subject (who, in my opinion, is the mortal man referred to by the rel. pronouns in a and d) approaches Indra because of the god's attainment of age. That old age is presented as a positive feature of Indra also gives the mortal reassurance that his own aging can likewise be positive.

As already noted, I do not follow the almost universal interpr. of the hapax *tribandhú-* as a PN nor the further identification of that PN with Vasiṣṭha. Instead I take it as the bahuvrīhi it is in full lexical value: 'having three bonds', with the bonds referring to kinship as *bándhu-* does so often. I further think that this is a reference to the three-generations model so prevalent later: a man with both father and son (or perhaps, as later, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather), ensuring the continuity of the male line and, esp. later, the śrāddha offerings to the ancestors. Although this theme is not prominent in the RV, it can be discerned indirectly in several passages; see X.135 (and my article "The Earliest Evidence for the Inborn Debts of a Brahmin: A New Interpretation of Ṛgveda X.135," *Journal asiatique* 302.2 [2014]: 245–57) and VI.20.11 (also discussed in that article, as well as comm. ad loc.). A man who had achieved the *tribandhú* state would be well along in years, and his approach to a similarly aging Indra would be appropriate. In fact, the depiction of Indra at this stage of life in this vs. contrasts strongly with the usual representation of Indra as young and virile. Note that *tribandhú-* may form a faint ring with *tripṛṣṭhá-* 'three-backed' in 1c.

In d we return to the afflictions visited on our unhappy man -- this time by (other) mortals. Thus a and d show him as the target of a divinity (the *devī́* Nirṛti, a) and men (*mártāḥ*, d), with Indra as the literal intercessor. Both Ge and Re tr. the clear subjunctive *kṛṇávanta* in d as a preterite ("beraubt haben," "ont rendu"), but there is no justification for this and neither provides one. Exactly what the other mortals will or would do isn't entirely clear to me, and it depends in great part on how we interpret *-veśa-* in the compd *ásvaveśa-*. In V.85.7, containing an array of apparently non-kin relationships, JPB tr. 'neighbor'; in IV.3.13, again in a set of calibrated relationships, I do so as well, though in X.49.5 the publ. tr. renders it as 'vassal' (but see now comm. ad loc.). Here, if I am correct about the sense of *tribandhú-*, *-veśa-* should refer to a relationship outside the close family line. The sense would be: when mortals deprive him of his non-blood (or less closely related) associates (pāda d), he still has his tight paternal lineage (*tribandhú-* pāda c). My 'clansmen' could be correct (based on the usual sense of *víś-*), but 'neighbor' or even 'vassal' (or Re's 'clientèle') could, too. I do not think Ge's Anhang fits, however. I now wonder, however, if Gr's "kein eigenes Haus habend, heimatlos" might be correct. In my general disc. of *veśá-* ad X.49.5 (q.v.), I take *veśá-* 'neighbor' as backformed to *prátiveśa-* 'neighbor', lit. 'having one's house facing/opposite', with an underlying *veśa-* 'house' (perhaps accented *véśa-* and the equivalent of Grk. ϝοῖκος, etc.). Our cmpd could contain this same 'house'; the point then would be that even if mortals deprive him of his dwelling, he will still have his kin. So I offer an alt. tr. here: "... bereft of his own house."

VII.37.8: The first pāda of this vs., *ā́ no ... stavádhyai*, is reminiscent of 1a *ā́ vo ... stavádhyai,* and thus forms a ring, already anticipated by the echo of 1c *tripṛṣṭhaíḥ* in 7c *tribandhúḥ*. However, it also makes an appeal to Savitar, who does not figure otherwise

in the hymn, and thus seems to anticipate the first two vss. of the next hymn, VII.38, which are dedicated to that god. Indeed the Anukr. identifies that whole hymn as dedicated to Savitar, but see publ. intro. to VII.38 for the view that it really is an All God hymn.

VII.38 Savitar [/All Gods]

On the likelihood that this is actually an All God hymn, despite the Anukr.'s ascription to Savitar and the domination of Savitar in the first vss., see publ. intro.

VII.38.1: On the presential value of the pf. of √*yam* and of this passage in particular, see Kü 395.

VII.38.3: Ge takes *ápi ... astu* as "...soll Anteil (an Opfer) haben," but this isn't necessary in the passage, and I know of no parallels with that sense.

VII.38.4: On the close parallel to our pāda a in the previous hymn, see comm. ad VII.37.7.

The sequence *váruṇaḥ ... mitrā́so aryamā́* presents a twist on the usual trio of the principal Ādityas, Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman, since *mitrā́saḥ* is plural and, as Ge suggests (n. 4d), must be a word play, referring to the common noun *mitrá-* 'ally'. Obviously the god Mitra must also be referenced, with *mitrā́saḥ* found in Mitra's usual place in the sequence of names.

VII.38.5: On this assortment of minor divinities, see publ. intro. In particular, *ékadhenu-* 'having one milk-cow' is a hapax, and who these beings are is otherwise unknown.

The structure of the vs. is quite loose. The initial *abhí* invites us to group the vs. with the preceding one, where *abhí* opens three of the four pādas (a, c, d) as the preverb with two forms of the root √*gṝ* (*gṛṇā́ti* a, *gṛṇanti* c). This is indeed how I construe it, with the main cl. represented only by *abhí* and a gapped **gṛṇanti* (hence my "(as do) those"), and the rest of the first hemistich occupied by the rel. cl. introduced by *yé*. In other words, the Gift Escorts, described in the relative clause, also greet Savitar. The root √*sap* does not otherwise appear with *abhí* (anywhere in Skt. as far as I know; *pace* Gr). Therefore taking the whole of the 1st hemistich, beginning with *abhí*, as a single rel. cl. (as Ge seems to) is not a favored option, esp. since there is no corresponding main clause in the vs.: the 2nd hemistich has a set of new sg. subjects and singular verbs. Ge is forced to take it as a syntactic truncation; see his —. Re gets out of this difficulty by supplying a pl. impv. to √*śru* for ab "(qu'ils nous écoutent)," parallel to *śṛṇotu* in c, but the *abhí* of pāda a seems to me to point to a connection with the previous vs. as just argued.

I do not understand what *mithó vanúṣaḥ* is meant to convey -- perhaps that the Gift Escorts avidly compete with each other to provide the best service? IX.97.37 *sápanti yám mithunā́so níkāmāḥ, adhvaryávaḥ ...* is similar, with both √*sap* and a form of √*mith* and with *níkāma-* 'eager' semantically matching our *vanúṣ-*; there the sense seems to be that the Adhvaryus of various sacrifices compete with each other to be best at serving Soma ("whom they serve, eager in rivalry -- the Adhvaryus ...").

The VP *rātím* √*sap* seems almost to be a gloss of the root-noun compd. *rāti-ṣā́c-* and might help us determine the function of this enigmatic group of divinities or semi-

divinities. The use of a transitive VP as apparent gloss makes it unlikely (at least to me) that *-sāc-* has a passive / intransitive sense in the cmpd (Scar's 'von Gaben begleitet' [593, Ge sim.], Re's 'qui ont le don pour attribut'). Gr's transitive 'Gabe gewährend, Spende betreibend' is closer to the mark, though muddling the sense of the root √*sac*.

The conj. *utá* is oddly positioned in the middle of its pāda, and it is not clear what it's conjoining. Klein (DGRV I.380) follows Re in positing an ellipsed **śṛnvantu* in the 1st hemistich, with the *utá* conjoining that clause with the *śṛṇotu* clause here. But even were we to supply that verb (see above for reasons not to), *utá* would still be out of position: we would expect it pāda-initial. I think that the *utá* is loosely conjoining this clause with what precedes, but that this does not require matching verbs. I further think that it has been postponed in order to allow *áhiḥ* to take initial position, in order to echo the *abhí*'s that open this vs. (5a) and three of the pādas in the preceding vs. (4a, c, d). Notably, two of the twelve pādas containing *áhir budhnyàḥ* elsewhere in the RV are opened by *utá* (I.186.5, VI.50.14), with the latter almost identical to ours except for the order of *utá* and the divine name: VI.50.14 *utá nó 'hir budhnyàḥ śṛṇotu*. This would give support to my view that the ordinary order was disrupted to allow the semi-rhyme of *#abhí / #áhi(ḥ).* (Note that when *utá* was moved to mid-pāda, it took the Wackernagel-positioned *naḥ* along with it.)

VII.38.6: The presence of *yā́ti* 'begs' in d solidifies the affiliation to the same root of the mid. part. *iyānáḥ* in b. I follow Re in taking the part. as a passive, though this interpr. is somewhat problematic. The pāda also appears identically in VII.52.3b, where the participle has transitive, though self-beneficial, usage. Ge takes it that way here as well ("darum bittend"), and Bl (RR, ad our passage) claims that there is "no good reason" to take *iyānáḥ* passively here. However, the context favors a passive interpr.: Bhaga gives the treasure away when we (or the powerless one of d) beg for it; I do not think Bhaga is himself begging it from Savitar, as an intermediate step before giving it away himself. Moreover, the same mid. part. is regularly used in the passive; cf., e.g., VII.17.7, 29.1 also in VII. Although I am reluctant to give identical pādas, esp. in the same maṇḍala, different interpretations, in this case the multivalence of the medial voice of this root (finite *ī́mahe* is regularly transitive, e.g.) allows the same sequence to be used in two different ways.

VII.38.7–8: These last two vss. concern the *vājínaḥ* 'prize-winners'. As indicated in the publ. intro., although most (in addition to the usual tr., see Oberlies RdV II.240) take these to be horses (as so often), I instead take the referent of *vājín-* to be the Maruts. In an All God hymn the default expectation is that gods are the dedicands. And there are numerous phraseological parallels that support the identification. See esp. nearby VII.36.7, where the Maruts are called *vājínaḥ*, as well as in the immediately preceding hymn, where VII.35.9 *śáṃ no bhavantu marútaḥ svarkā́ḥ* is almost identical, save for the expressed subj., to our 7ab *śáṃ no bhavantu vājínaḥ ... svarkā́ḥ*. The stem *svarká-* occurs only 3 times; besides these two occurrences, the third, in I.88.1, refers to the Maruts' chariots. The voc. phrase *amṛtā ṛtājāḥ* in our 8b is found also, addressed to the Maruts, in V.57.8 *ámṛtā ṛ́tājāḥ* (accented).

VII.38.7: On *jambháya-* 'crush', see comm. ad II.23.9 and my *-áya*-Formations, p. 93.

The cmpd. *sanemí-* lit. means ‘along with its/the felly’ (see, e.g., AiG III.75, EWA s.v. *némi-*), but is a way to express ‘entirely’ (“felly and all”): “with all its gear,” “bag and baggage,” “lock, stock, and barrel” are idiomatic English equivalents.

VII.38.8: It is appropriate that the *vājín*s should be the topic in a clause with the āmreḍita loc. absol. *vā́je-vāje*. The etym. figure would be clearer if the loc. had been tr. “whenever prizes (are at stake)” vel sim.

VII.39 All Gods

VII.39.1: The first pāda somewhat echoes the first hemistich of the preceding hymn (VII.38.1ab), with the final verb *aśret* mimicking likewise final *áśiśret* in 38.1b and the verb’s object *sumatím* resembling *amátim* in 38.1b and in the same metrical position. This is perhaps an additional reason to consider VII.38 to be fundamentally an All God hymn properly situated in the All God cycle, rather than an intrusive hymn to Savitar. See disc. in the publ. intro. to VII.38.

I do not know the referent of *vásvaḥ*. Perhaps, given the connections with VII.38.1, it is Savitar. The same phrase *sumatím* (...) *vásvaḥ* is found in III.4.1 (an Āprī hymn), but the referent is no clearer there. Ge suggests that the referent is Agni himself. This would work in both passages and may be correct; inter alia Agni is frequently the referent of *vásu-*, but the non-signalling of coreference with the subject still seems a little odd. The pl. *vásavaḥ* appears in vs. 3 modifying the gods.

On the idiom PATH √*bhaj* see comm. ad VII.18.16.

The publ. tr. fails to render *naḥ* in d. I would emend to “will offer our true (hymn)” or “will offer for us ...”

Both Ge and Re avoid making *ṛtám* obj. of *yajāti*, both by making it an adverbially used acc. of respect (vel sim.): “... möge er ... das Opfer *richtig* [my italics] vollziehen” and “(selon) l’Ordre.” I follow Lü (436–39, esp. 439) in considering *ṛtám* ‘truth’ here a representation of ‘hymn’: “... möge ... ein Lied darbringen.”

VII.39.2: This vs. presents a number of minor problems. The first is the usage of the verb in pāda a, med. pf. *prá vāvṛje*. Ge and Re interpr. it as passive, e.g., “Das Barhis ist ... gelegt,” as does Kü (461). Since this is the only med. form of the pf., against several act. transitive ones, this is possible, but it should be noted that med. forms of the present are generally transitive. Cf. very similar VII.2.4 *prá vṛñjate ... barhíḥ*, where the 3rd pl. form of the verb precludes a passive reading. Moreover, the passive reading would require the adj. *suprayā́(ḥ)* to modify neut. *barhíḥ*; in my opinion (contra Gr and possibly Ge, Re; see also Old’s somewhat cryptic n. to II.3.5), this form belongs to the *s*-stem *suprayás-* and is, in my view, a nom. sg. masc. Although *s*-stems cmpds sometimes have the ending *-ā́s* when modifying neut. sgs. (see comm. ad VII.24.2 in this maṇḍala, as well as II.31.5), on the whole it is best to interpret such forms as masc. when that’s possible. The difficulty disappears if we take *vāvṛje* as transitive, supplying Agni from vs. 1 as subject. Undoubted acc. forms of the *s*-stem adj. (*suprayásam*) modify Agni 3 times out of the 4 clear occurrences of the stem (II.2.1, 4.1, VI.11.4). Although Agni in his physical form as fire is not a likely twister of barhis, of course, he has just been identified as a Hotar in 1d and in his priestly role could perform other priestly actions.

I take *eṣām* as gen. for dat., as often, and referring to the gods (so also Ge, Re).

As noted in the publ. intro., the hapax *bîriṭa* (in sandhi; Pp. *bîriṭe*) in b is completely opaque. See EWA s.v. The only thing that is clear is that it has aberrant, non-Indo-Aryan phonology, with plain *b* and unmotivated retroflex *ṭ*. It is not even evident what grammatical form it might be: standing next to dual *viśpátī*, it might be expected to be a dual as well. Indeed a pragṛhya *bîriṭe* would be better metrically, as Old points out. However, it should then be a *neuter* dual, which would not harmonize with m. *viśpátī*; it would have to refer to a different pair of entities. If the sandhi represented in the Saṃhitā text is correct, however, it could be a loc. in *-e*. Both Ge and Re take it as such, following in their tr. Yāska's gloss *gaṇa-* (see also Kuiper, Aryans 31 and Kü 461), and both construe *viśā́m* in the next pāda with it ("in der Gefolgschaft ihre Clanleute" and "dans l'arroi des clans" respectively). A hemistich boundary between a locative and its dependent genitive seems highly unlikely to me, esp. when it is not a well-known standard expression. In the publ. tr. I take it as a loc., but decline to translate. This seems the lesser of two evils. Unlike many problematic hapaxes, this one does not seem to be phonologically generated.

With Ge and Re, I interpr. the verb in b, *ā́ ... iyāte*, as 'hasten here'. Lub classifies it with √*yā* 'beseech, beg', and the morphology supports him: the form cannot belong with well-attested *îyate* 'hastens' both because of its short root syllable and because of its athematic ending, whereas it could easily belong to the medial root pres. of 'beg' (cf. part. *iyāná-*). But 'beg' does not fit the context, and esp. with Vāyu forming one of the paired subjects and with the time specified as dawn and the occasion the Early Invocation, the common formulaic *vā́yav ā́ yāhi* (I.2.1, etc.) and its variants, calling Vāyu to the first pressing, imposes itself here. I don't understand the morphology, but a poet who could inflict *bîriṭe* on us is capable of confecting a nonce verb form in the same pāda.

If *viśā́m* is not dependent on *bîriṭe*, what is it doing? A survey of the occurrences of this gen. pl. reveals that it is often pāda-initial (as here) and dependent on *viśpáti-* (e.g., III.2.10, 13.5, V.4.3), *páti-* (e.g., I.127.8, VI.15.1), or a similar authority figure. I therefore loosely construe it with *viśpatī* in b, though I resupply that word in c. Alternatively, II.4.1 *viśā́m agním átithiṃ suprayásam* "Agni, the guest of the clans, who receives very pleasurable offerings" is suggestive, since it contains a form of *suprayás-* modifying Agni. But 'guest' is missing in our passage, and in any case the *suprayás-* form is in a different clause.

As for the *aktór uṣásaḥ* phrase, Ge. (n. 2c) has convinced me that it's an abbreviated version of *uṣáso yā́man aktóḥ* "at the coming of dawn from night" (III.30.13, VI.38.4). Perhaps the loc. *yā́man* was gapped because of the presence of the loc. *pūrváhūtau*, although the latter is not part of the same phrase.

The epithet *niyútvan-* 'possessing a team' is primarily used of Vāyu, and therefore, although Pūṣan intervenes between *vāyúḥ* and *niyútvān*, it must modify Vāyu, with the name and the epithet polarized at the edges of the pāda.

Vāyu and Pūṣan do not generally appear together and do not form a natural pair; I don't know the reason for their joint appearance here. As far as I know, Pūṣan has no part in the Morning Pressing.

VII.39.3: There is almost universal agreement that *jmayā́* represents an adverbial instr. of exactly that shape, despite the hiatus, rather than Pp. *jmayā́ḥ*. See, e.g., Old, Re, Scar 421, with lit.

With Sāy., cited by Ge, the Maruts must be the referents of *śubhrā́ḥ* in b: pl. forms of this adj. generally modify the Maruts, and the midspace is especially associated with them.

Note that *marjayanta* must be reflexive, with real medial value, rather than being a straight transitive *-anta* replacement of the type commonly found with *-áya*-formations.

On *urujrayaḥ* see comm. ad V.54.2.

Assuming that Agni is the messenger in d (so, e.g., Ge), this vs. contains both standard (if contradictory) models of the sacrifice: "the gods come to the sacrifice" and "the sacrifice goes to the gods."

VII.39.4: Pāda b contains *víśve ... devā́ḥ*, though distracted. Since this is the middle vs. of the hymn, this specification of the dedicands of the hymn may constitute a not very noteworthy omphalos. It also introduces a brief flood of named gods (4d, 5).

VII.39.5: In the first hemistich Agni appears to be playing on both sides, as it were: he is commanded (voc. *agne*) to bring (*ā́ ... vaha*) a series of gods here, including Agni (acc. *agním*) at the end of pāda b. This seems conceptually odd: Agni the god does not need to be brought to the sacrifice -- he's already there -- and it is also hard to see how he would bring himself. Ge's (n. 5b) explanation that including Agni in the list serves for "Vervollständigung der Götterversammlung" seems weak. In that case we might expect Agni to come at the end of the list, and in any case too many gods are missing fom the list to consider it a complete collection. It might be possible to consider the Agni to be brought as the celestial Agni, i.e., the sun. But I think it more likely that *agním* is parallel to *gíraḥ* in pāda a, and both are acc. of goal, expressing the ritual elements the gods will encounter at the ritual: hymns and the ritual fire. The standard tr. take *gíraḥ* in this way, and I see no reason why *agním* can't have the same function.

In c *eṣā́m* is hard to construe. I follow Old in accepting the BR emendation to **eṣám* 'quick'. Old cites the parallel in the very next hymn VII.40.5 *víṣṇor eṣásya*. As Old points out, the corruption can have arisen on the basis of likewise pāda-final *eṣā́m* in 2a. There are of course no metrical consequences. The emendation was not explicitly signaled in the publ. tr., which should read "... Viṣṇu, *the quick." Neither Ge nor Re accepts (or even takes note of) this emendation.

VII.39.6: I take *yajñíyānām* as gen. for dat., as in 2a.

In b I assume that Agni obtains from the gods, and then gives to mortals, what the latter wish. Cf. a fuller expression in VI.5.7 *aśyā́ma táṃ kā́mam agne távotī* "May we attain this desire, Agni, through your help." On the basis of that passage, as well as X.96.7 *só asya kā́maṃ ... ānaśe*, both with *kā́mam* √*(n)aś*, I also take *nákṣat* as an *s*-aor. subjunctive to √*(n)aś*, rather than as an injunc. to √*nakṣ*, *pace* Narten (s-aor. 160) and Gotō (1st Kl. 192), who assert that no such subj. exists to √*(n)aś*.

In d I take the position of *nú* within the instr. phrase *yúj̱yebhir nú devaíḥ* seriously, indicating that the gods are *now* to be our yokemates, now that we have made successful sacrifice to them.

VII.39.7: A fine meta-summary vs., which is also the final vs. of the next hymn (VII.40.7).

VII.40 All Gods

VII.40.1: The standard interpr. take *vidathyā̃* as nom. sg. fem. modifying *śruṣṭíḥ* (e.g., Thieme [Unters. 48] "die zur Verteilung führende Erhörung"), and this is certainly the default reading. However, it leaves the *sám* in the VP *sám etu* with little to do, and I wonder if *vidathyā̃* is not instead an instr. sg. fem., which would justify the lexeme *sám* √*i* 'come together'. This adj. modifies *vā̃c-* in I.167.3, and "hearing" and "ceremonial (speech)" would make a nice pair. The speech would also stimulate the praise (*stómam*) we aim at the gods in the next pāda.

In b I take *práti ... dadhīmahi* in its idiomatic sense, 'to fix an arrow (on a bowstring), to aim', though a more generic one (Ge 'anheben', Re 'commencer') is hardly out of the question.

In d *ratnínaḥ* 'possessing treature' is perfectly ambiguous: it can be a gen. sg. and modify *asya* (standing for Bhaga) or a nom. pl. modifying the 1st pl. subj. of *syā̃ma*. In the publ. tr. I take it as the former (as does Thieme loc. cit.), while Ge and Re take it as the latter (though Re recants in his notes, deciding that the gen. sg. is better, on the basis of *ratna-bhā̃j-* VII.81.4). In fact, I think it's probably meant to be both, with the nom. pl. a proleptic use, and would now emend the tr. to "may we, possessing [=acquiring] treasure, be at the apportioning of him who possesses treasures."

Gr (s.v. *ratnín-*), Ge, Re, and Thieme (loc. cit.) all take the referent of *asya* to be Savitar, and the presence of unaccented *asya*, which should refer to someone/-thing already in the discourse, supports this interpr. However, since the next hymn (VII.41) is entirely devoted to Bhaga as distributor of goods and since *vibhāgé* appears to be a pun on his name, I think Bhaga is equally plausible. The lack of accent on *asya* could be accounted for by this pun.

VII.40.2: A series of four singular nouns are the subject of *dadātu*, a singular verb.

The verb *niyuvaíte* is esp. appropriate for Vāyu, who is regularly called *niyútvant-* 'having a team'. Note the use of this adj. in the immed. preceding hymn, VII.39.2, where it must qualify Vāyu rather than Pūṣan, despite the word order (see comm. ad loc.).

VII.40.3: The pl. verb *junánti* in c has two singular subjects, Agni and Sarasvatī, which should trigger a dual verb, or else a singular one as in 2ab. Since Agni and Sarasvatī do not form a stable set of gods (as, e.g., Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman do), it is not clear what god or gods should be supplied to justify the plural verb. Re adds a parenthetical "(et autres)"; possibly the Maruts addressed in the first hemistich?

With Ge and Re, I take *tásya* as a dependent genitive limiting *rāyáḥ* and referring to the man whom the Maruts, Agni, and Sarasvatī help -- not as a demonstrative adjective with *rāyáḥ*, which would be grammatically possible.

VII.40.4: Contrary to Ge and Re, I take pādas a-c as a clause subordinate to the main cl. of d.

On *anarvā́* as the nom. sg. of a fem. *n*-stem, see JPB (Ādityas 218)

VII.40.5: Flg. Old, I emend *vayā́* to *'vayā́* (=*avayā́*) 'propitiation', which only requires the insertion of an avagraha but no emendation. Ge and Re also accept this suggestion. The word should have been marked with an asterisk in the publ. tr.

VII.41 Bhaga (or All Gods)

Like VII.38, which is essentially an All Gods hymn though ascribed by the Anukramaṇī to Savitar, this hymn is properly located within the All Gods sequence, the last of three 7-verse hymns in Triṣṭubh (save for our vs. 1 in Jagatī), followed by an All Gods hymn of 6 vss. Nonetheless, the Anukramaṇī assigns most of it (vss. 2–6) to Bhaga, with vs. 1 to the Liṅgoktadevatāḥ and vs. 7, an extrahymnic vs. (see publ. intro.) to Uṣas. The 1st vs. calls on a range of gods, including Bhaga (pāda c), in monotonous fashion, before settling down to exclusive focus on Bhaga beginning with vs. 2, and it was surely meant as an All God hymn and positioned in the All God collection for that reason. The hymn is also found in AV (Ś III.16, P IV.31)

VII.41.1: As was just noted, this vs. is in Jagatī in an otherwise Triṣṭubh hymn (and hymn sequence) -- or rather its first three quarters are. The final pāda is in Triṣṭubh and ends with the verb 1st pl. opt. *huvema*, which gives a Triṣṭubh cadence and also ends the first pāda of the next vs. (2a), contrasting with its semantic match 1st pl. pres. indic. *havāmahe* in the first pāda (1a), which provides a Jagatī cadence. The switch in meter at the end of the vs., cleverly accomplished while holding the verb essentially constant, and the variant repetition of the opening of the 2nd hemistich, *prātár bhágam*, at the opening of vs. 2, *prātar(-jítam) bhágam*, knit the 1st vss. together despite the metrical difference and the range of gods in vs. 1.

VII.41.2: On the first pāda of this vs. see comm. immediately above.

The referent of the repeated rel. prn. *yá-* (b, c, d) is Bhaga, and we therefore might expect that in the sequence in d *yám bhágam* the latter word refers to the god (as the same acc. does in pāda a and in 1c). But instead it is almost surely merely a pun on the divine name and its first reading is as the homonymous (and of course etymologically identical) common noun 'portion' -- though the more usual word for 'portion' is *bhāgá-*. At best it could be read twice, once as the name, once the common noun ("which Bhaga ... portion ..."). If we follow the Pp., *bhágam* must be part of the quotation ended by *íti*, because the other word in the quotation, *bhakṣi*, is read by the Pp. as unaccented and cannot therefore be initial in the quotation/clause. In principle, however, the sandhi form *bhakṣîti* could contain both an accented particle *íti* and an accented *bhakṣí*, contra the Pp. which could -- and should -- then be the only word in the quotation.

Part -- but only part -- of the solution depends on how we analyze the verb form. Old and Ge inter alia (e.g., Scar 157) take it as a 1st sg. middle, which could therefore be accented, since medial *s*-aor. forms take accent on the ending (cf. *bhakṣīyá*, *bhakṣīmahí*) -- though it need not be. (Indeed no one, as far as I know, rejects the unaccented Pp reading in favor of **bhakṣí*.) I follow the view of Sāy. (also Gr, Wh. [AV tr. III.16.2], Narten [p. 179 n. 512] inter alia [see Old's reff.]), that it is a 2nd sg. act., that is, a *-si* impv. (ultimately derived from the act. *s*-aor. subjunctive; cf. *bhakṣat*), where we should

expect root accent (**bhákṣi*) if the form were to be accented. Because there seems to be universal agreement that *bhakṣi* is unaccented, the divergent interpretations of the morphology do not affect the interpr. of where the quotation begins, but it seems worthwhile to point out the possible interpr. not taken.

One reason I prefer the *-si* impv. interpr. is that the 1st sg. interpr. might impose more modality on an injunctive than we might expect: cf. Ge's "ich möchte ... teilhaft werden" (though Scar's "ich bekomme ..." avoids modality). The context favors a request, rather than a statement of accomplishment.

VII.41.3: Although the *prātár* of vs. 1 and 2a has disappeared, this vs. seems to contain a reminiscence of it: 1c *#prātár bhágam* is echoed by 3a *#bhága prá(ṇe)tar* (in opposite order), and pādas c and d then pick up *prá ṇ(etar)* of 3a in *#bhága prá ṇo* and *#bhága prá ṇ́bhiḥ* (latter without retroflexion). This is hardly the most sophisticated effect in Rigvedic poetry, but it is an illustration of the subtle concatenative effects that can provide unity and a throughline in even the most banal (as this hymn mostly is) composition.

VII.41.3–5: The concatenation continues in the next vss. The ending of vs. 3, ... *nṛvántaḥ syāma*, echoes in the following two vss. The 1st pl. opt. *syāma* is repeated at the end of 4a and d and 5b, while the *-vant*-stem adj. shifts from *nṛvántaḥ* (3d) to another punning *bhágavantaḥ* (both 'possessing a portion' and 'accompanied by Bhaga') in *bhágavantaḥ syāma* (4a, 5b; cf. *bhágavān* 5a). And *bhágavān* in 5a matches *maghavan* in the same metrical position in 4c.

VII.41.4: On the structural relationship of the various *utá*-s here, see Klein DGRV I.355–56.

VII.41.5: The punning continues here with a clever twist: even Bhaga himself should become possessed of a portion (*bhágavant-*) (a); (only) in this way (*téna*) will we become *bhágavant-* (b). In other words, Bhaga needs to get his own portion before he can pass it on to us.

This vs. forms a slight ring with vs. 1: the intensive verb *johavīti* provides one additional stem to the two forms of √*hū* in vs. 1, *havāmahe* and *huvema*.

VII.41.6–7: It is possible to take these two verses as forming a conceptual ring with vs. 1. The first vs. contains six occurrences of the adv. *prātár* 'in the early morning. As noted in the publ. intro., this early morning context disappears from the hymn until the last two verses focusing on the Dawns.

VII.41.6: This vs., bringing the Dawns into the picture, forms the transition to the extra-hymnic vs. 7 (see publ. intro.). Note that we have the newer nom. pl. form *uṣásaḥ* in 6, whereas 7, a repeated vs. (=VII.80.3), has the inherited *uṣ́ásaḥ*.

The racehorse Dadhikrā(van) seems intrusive in this vs., but he is the subject of the nearby hymn VII.44. Here as there he is associated with dawn and the Dawns. As suggested in the publ. intro. to that hymn, the association may be with the dakṣiṇā, which is distributed at the morning pressing and which often consists at least partly of horses.

VII.41.7: Though this vs. is also found, better situated, in a Dawn hymn (VII.80.3) and is quite possibly extrahymnic here, the emphasis on the valuable goods, esp. livestock, that the Dawns bring, to distribute as dakṣinā, well fits the hope for a good portion that characterizes the rest of the hymn. Note esp. that in 3cd we hope to be propagated with cows and horses (*góbhir áśvaiḥ*) and to become possessed of men (*nṛvántaḥ*), matched here by the entities by which the Dawns are accompanied: *áśvāvatīr gómatīḥ ... vīrávatīḥ*.

VII.42–43: All Gods

These two hymns are in some ways companion pieces, progressing similarly through the ritual and sharing means of expression and images. For details see individual discussions below.

VII.42 All Gods

VII.42.1: The first three pādas of this vs. begin with *prá* 'forth' and seem to express the dynamic beginning of the sacrifice. None of the three verbs (√*nakṣ*, √*vī*, √*nū*) is commonly found with *prá*, so the use of the preverb here seems situational -- that is, the three *prá* √X are not standard lexemes; rather, the poet has attached *prá* to all three to emphasize that all parts of the sacrifice are setting out at once.

krandanú- is a hapax, built with the rare suffix *-anú-* (AiG II.2.210). Of the very few other such stems, one -- *nadanú-* 'roar' (1x, also *nadanú-mant-* 1x) -- belongs to the same semantic field, and another -- *nabhanú-* 'spurting' (1x, also *nabhanū́-* 1x) -- belongs to the same root as the genitive qualifier of our form *nabhanyà-* 'inclined to / about to burst out'. I think it likely that this roar refers to all the sonic parts of the sacrifice: the just kindled fire (for *agní-* as subject of √*krand*, cf. e.g., X.45.4), the soma (often the subject of √*krand* in IX), the hymns (cf. VII.20.9, with *stóma-* as subj.)., and most likely also the pressing stones that appear in d.

The cows "swimming in water" in c presumably stand in for the milk to mix with the soma, though the exact ritual reference is unclear. In the soma sacrifice it is the soma that undergoes a water bath (see IX.106.8 where *udaprút-* modifies the soma drops), not the milk.

The verb *yujyā́tām* in d requires some discussion. On the surface, the form is a 3rd du. act. opt. root aor., and this is how Ge and Re render it and how Gr and Lub classify it. Old, however, points out that the pressing stones are usually yoked (in the passive) rather than yoking something else (in the active). He wishes to take it instead as built to the passive stem *yujyá-*, but the question then is what the form is meant to be. Old himself favors a passive injunctive: though this should have the form **yujyetām*, he suggests that the rarity of such forms might have generated the "wrong" form on the analogy of athematic 3rd du. med. injunctives/imperfects in *-ātām*. He also floats the possibility of a subjunctive, though that should have the primary ending (expect **yujyāte*, I suppose, not at this period the **yujyaite* of the grammars). Although the publ. tr. reflects Old's view that the context favors a passive, I now believe that the act. opt. analysis of Ge/Re, etc., with *péśaḥ* 'ornament', referring to the soma, as object, is correct. The passage, and the verb, would play with the standard passive expression (pressing stones are yoked), but

take them as agents of the yoking. I would therefore now emend the tr. to "The two pressing stones should yoke the ornament of the ceremony."

VII.42.2: The 'road' of Agni, *ádhvan-*, in pāda a picks up its etymological relative *adhvará-* 'ceremony, lit. ritual cursus' in 1d, a relationship unfortunately difficult to convey without awkwardness in tr.

Sāy. reads **sú te* for *suté*, and Old favors this reading on the grounds that *suté* is rare in Agni context. But since the last hemistich of the preceding vs. (and possibly pāda b as well) concerns the soma, this does not seem a cogent enough objection to change the text. Sāy. likewise reads **jánimā níṣattaḥ* rather than *jánimāni sattáḥ*. This would make fine sense -- and *ní √sad* is a very common idiom for Agni's seating at the ritual when acting as Hotar -- but it again requires emending a text that makes sense on its own.

As indicated in the publ. intro., the varicolored horses in bc are Agni's flames. The "I" of d is presumably the poet impersonating Agni as Hotar.

VII.42.3: The pl. subj. of *mahayan* in pāda is unclear; the most likely referent would be the priestly colleagues of the 1st ps. sg. poet subj. of *huvé* in 2d; in this spirit Ge supplies "die Sänger," Re "les chanteurs." However, Old adduces the almost identical passage VII.61.6 *sám u vāṃ yajñám mahayaṃ námobhiḥ* with 1st sg. *mahayam*. Noting that small differences between otherwise identical passages are common, he does not insist on the 1st sg. interpr. However, given the 1st sg. of 2d, I am now inclined to consider this a strong possibility, and would emend the translation (or at least provide as an alternative): "*I magnify the sacrifice for you all ..." This makes the interpr. of *vaḥ* easier: as is common with such enclitics in ritual context, *vaḥ* should refer to the rest of the officiants, but if they are also the 3rd ps. subjects of *mahayan*, this produces a clash. The emendation of *-n* to *-ṃ* is of course trivial.

The *prá* of vs. 1 returns in d, though in the common idiom *prá √ric* 'project, extend beyond, surpass'. The medial pf. of this root, acdg. to Kü (426–27), is always presential and has the stative sense "hervorhinausragen über *Abl.*" The ablative is of course missing here. In our passage I think the sense is primarily physical: the ritual fire is gaining strength and its flames project outward on the ritual ground ("in the nearness" *upāké*), though the fire's surpassing superiority may also be referenced. The physical image is found, differently expressed, in the companion hymn VII.42 in vs. 2d *ūrdhvā́ śocíṃṣi ... asthuḥ* "The flames have stood up erect." Given the *prá* here, this *might* be taken as a reference to the movement of the ritual fire to the east, but the fire seems to me to be already established in its location.

Both Ge and Re supply a 'speech' element to their interpr. of *mandrá-*, "wohlredende" and "à la voix-harmonieuse" respectively, but its derivation from *√ma(n)d* 'exhilarate/be exhilarated / gladden/be glad' does not suggest or require such a semantic extension. It is true that the adj. regularly modifies *jihvā́-* / *juhū́-* 'tongue' and is also found in the bahuvrīhi *mandrá-jihva-* 'having *mandrá* tongue(s)'. But generally when Agni's tongue is mentioned, it is as the instrument for eating the oblation and conveying it to the gods, not as a speech organ. His tongue is gladdening because it gives the gods pleasing nourishment. Agni himself is very often *mandrá-* as well, as in our passage -- probably for at least two reasons: 1) like his tongue, he is the conveyor of the oblation to the gods, 2) he produces general gladness by his presence and role in the

sacrifice. Both factors are probably at issue here: in c he is commanded to sacrifice to the gods (thus conveying the oblation to them); in vs. 4, esp. d, he gives "a desirable reward" to the mortals whose dwelling he is established in.

VII.42.4: For *dāti* see comm. ad IV.8.3.

VII.42.5: The *adhvarám* of pāda a echoes *adhvarásya* in 1d and provides a faint ring, since the last vs. (6) is extra-hymnic.

In the publ. tr. in c the verb *sadatām* is taken as a sg. impv. with Agni as subject. At best, this would be a middle 3rd sg. (though tr. as a 2nd ps.), to a stem, and indeed a root, that is otherwise relentlessly active. This is just an error on my part. The form must be a 3rd du. act. impv., with Night and Dawn (the decoupled dual dvandva *náktā ... uṣā́sā*) as subj. -- as is the standard interpr. (Gr, Ge, Re). The tr. should be emended to "Let Night and Dawn sit here on the ritual grass." Although this may be conceptually difficult to interpret -- times of day do not usually have a physical presence at the ritual, and it is hard to conceive Night and Dawn sitting on the barhis – it is in fact a standard trope in the Āprī hymns; see, e.g., I.142.7, 188.6; VII.2.6; X.70.6, 110.6). For the "repair" of this image in the next hymn, see comm. ad VII.43.3. The ultimate reference is probably to the daily offering to Agni at the two twilights (later called the Agnihotra), though the immediate source must be the Āprī litanies.

Note the pāda-spanning phonetic figure in cd: *uṣā́sā ◡uśántā*.

VII.42.6: As just indicated, this vs. belongs to the class of "meta" final vss., commenting on the hymn just completed. I would now be inclined to tr. the root pres. injunc. *staut* as "has just praised."

The second pāda is interesting for the interaction between analytic phrases and compounds. That is, the first member of the bahuvrīhi *rāyás-kāma-* 'having desire for wealth', *rāyáḥ*, itself a gen. case form rather than stem form in composition, is modified by / compared to an independent gen. *viśvápsnyasya*, as already disc. by Wack, AiG II.1.33. The connection of this adj. with 'wealth' is clear from VIII.97.15, where the independent gen. *rāyáḥ* is modified by *viśvápsnyasya*: *kadā́ ... rāyá ā́ daśasyer, viśvápsnyasya ...* See disc. of this and similar exx. in my forthcoming "Limits on Indo-Iranian Compounding" (Ged. G. Holland). On the sense of the adj., see comm. ad VIII.97.15.

VII.43 All Gods

VII.43.1–2: The 1st two vss. of this hymn begin with *prá*, recalling the insistent *prá* in the 1st vs. of the preceding hymn (VII.42.1) and presumably fulfilling the same function: to express the energetic initiation of the ritual. However, both *prá √ṛc* (1a) and *prá √i* (2a) are standard lexemes, unlike those in 42.1.

VII.43.1: The inf. *iṣádhyai* is a hapax and variously interpr.: e.g., Ge "dass sie gern kommen," Re "en sorte que (nous) en tirions profit." The root affiliation is also not entirely clear; e.g., Lub classifies it with *√iṣ* 'send', though we do not of course know how he would tr. it. Both Re's disc. and his tr. seem to me plausible: he takes it as "un

doublet isolé d'*iṣayádhyai*" and cites Burrow's (1955) interpr. "pour que nous soyons prospères." It is worth noting that the few instances of *iṣayádhyai* (I.183.3=VI.49.5, VI.64.4) also occur in a Triṣṭubh cadence *and* that that form in isolation is ill-formed for such a cadence, since the root syllable should be heavy in such a cadence. In I.183.3=VI.49.5 this problem is avoided because the root syllable amalgamates with a preceding final vowel: *yéna narā nāsat*$^{\text{i}}$*yeṣayádhyai.* But in VI.64.4 *rayím divo duhitar iṣayádhyai* the cadence is simply bad (and in fact produces an uninterrupted run of 5 light syllables). Haplology of the suffix *-ayá-* to our form *iṣádhyai* here fixes this metrical problem.

víprā in c, modifying *bráhmāṇi*, is the only neut. N/A form of this stem, but the stem does modify a different word for thought/poetic formulation, *matí-*, as fem. *víprā* (VII.66.8, VIII.25.24). The Pp. analyzes it instead as nom. pl. m. *víprāḥ*, which is of course a possible form underlying the sandhi, but which cannot be easily fitted into the sentence. Sāy. does it by sleight of hand: he glosses the first part of pāda c as *yeṣāṃ viprāṇāṃ medhāvināṃ brahmāṇi*, converting the supposed nom. pl. *viprāḥ* into a gen. pl., and then supplies *viprāḥ* as subj. of *pra ... arcan* in the main clause in a: *te viprāḥ prārcann pūrveṇa saṃbandhaḥ*, an attempt to justify the nom. in the rel. cl. Needless to say, this doesn't actually work.

The verb *viyánti* in d is ambiguous. With the Pp., Gr., etc., it may be taken as belonging to *ví* √*i* 'go apart, spread out', but it could also belong to the root pres. of √*vī* 'pursue, go in quest'. In a rel. cl. the accent would be the same for either analysis. Because of the connections between the preceding hymn VII.42 and this one, I favor the latter affiliation on the basis of (*prá*) *vetu* in VII.42.1b, but *ví* √*i* is certainly not excluded -- and might make slightly better sense with the simile. The tr. might then alternatively read "go apart" for "go questing." On the other hand, I like the idea of formulations going in quest of divine response and rewards, an interpr. encouraged by the *prá* lexemes (like *prá ... etu* in the next pāda, 2a).

VII.43.2: In c I construe dat. *adhvarā́ya* with *sādhú*, giving the latter richer semantics than the mere adverbial "richtig" of Ge or even Re's "correctement." Found twice in VII.42 (1d, 5a), *adhvará-* reappears here, though the word is too common to make much of this.

As noted above ad 42.3, our pāda d seems to be a clearer expression of the image of the increasing flames of the ritual fire found also in 42.3b.

VII.43.3: In two of its four occurrences *víbhṛtra-* means something like 'dispersed', but that makes no sense here. The third occurrence is similar to ours, however: I.95.2 ... *janayanta gárbham ... víbhṛtram*. In both these instances it seems to be an idiomatic expression for children of an age to be carried around, in I.95.2 of the new-born fire. In our passage both Ge's "die Tragekinder" and Re's "des fils (en âge) d'être portés" seem on the money. Since Eng. lacks a useful expression (or means to make one) like Tragekind, my tr. is an attempt to convey the sense in brief and also to capture the implied locus of the children in our passage. In the simile they are said to be sitting on their mother (acc. *mātáram*), but in the frame the corresponding term is loc. *sā́nau* 'on the back', and I suggest that the mother's back is implied in the simile as well. The difference

between acc. *mātáram* and loc. *sā́nau* is a fairly trivial example of the "case disharmony in similes" discussed in detail in my 1982 IIJ article of the same name.

In b the gods are urged to take their seats (*devā́saḥ ... sadantu*) on the barhis. The action ordered is of course unremarkable and repeated numerous times in the RV, but in the context of this sequence of hymns it can be considered a "repair." In the preceding hymn, in VII.42.5, Night and Dawn are given the same command, also in the 3rd ps., also in the thematic aor. (*náktā ... sadatām uṣā́sā*). As was noted there, this produces an unusual image, though interpretable in an Āprī context; 43.3 replaces and thus repairs it with the familiar one.

In c the problem is that neither of the fem. adjectives -- nom. *viśvā́cī* or acc. *vidathyā́m* -- modifies an expressed noun, and the referential possibilites are wide open. Ge follows Sāy. by taking the nom. as the sacrificial ladle and the acc. as the flame, though in his n. (3c) he suggests that 'speech' would be possible for both. Re follows Th. (Unters. 49) in taking over *devátāt-* from d as the acc., tr. "(la troupe des dieux) arrivant au sacrifice," while maintaining the ladle as the nom. (One might think that the gods might find this an odd and messy welcome!) Old thinks the nom. is definitely the ladle, but suggests various possibilities for the acc. On the basis of I.167.3 *vidathyā́ ... vā́k*, I take the acc. as speech, with the anointing metaphorical: the ladle pours the butter offering into the ritual fire as ritual speech is recited. There is precedent for this metaphor: cf. I.61.5 *arkám ... sám añje* and I.64.1 *gíraḥ sám añje* with 'chant' and 'hymns', respectively, as object of 'anoint'.

VII.43.4: The isolated form *sīṣapanta* is hard to assess. By form it appears to belong to a redupl. aor., but no other forms to such a stem are attested and, more to the point, there is no securely attested *-áya*-transitive. I cannot evaluate *sāpáyant-* in TB II.4.6.5, which is evidently the Brāhmaṇa form Whitney lists, with ?, in Roots s.v. √*sap*, but even if it belongs to the same root, it is attested too late to provide a basis on which to generate an associated redupl. aor. in the RV. Nonetheless, I see no choice but to take *sīṣapanta* as a redupl. aor. and to assume an unattested **sāpáyati* for early Vedic. What then does *sīṣapanta* mean? In my 1983 *-áya-* monograph (p. 219) I assert that it has intrans./reflex. sense, is not connected with a causative, and that it is based on nearby *sápante* (VII.38.5) (without specifiying how), but I no longer believe that. Nor, despite the temptation of the *-anta* ending, do I believe it's an *-anta* replacement. Rather I would now take it as a reflexive transitive 'serve themselves' (or, since that English idiom is too colloquial, 'do service to themselves'). The basis for this is expressed in the next pāda: the gods do their own milking (*dúhānāḥ*), producing the "streams of truth," presumably the praise hymns, by their own actions -- thus serving themselves. See Lüders (473, 475), who argues for "stream of truth" as Kultlied and (475) interprets this hemistich essentially as I do. This may be a variant on the notion that the gods are the ultimate source of the hymns that praise them because they provide the inspired thoughts to the poets, or it may be that the sheer arrival of the gods at the ritual ground provides the impetus for the "milking" of the hymns.

On the phrase *ṛtásya ... sudúghā(ḥ)* see comm. ad X.43.9.

Both Ge and Re take the 2nd hemistich as a single cl., with *máhaḥ* as goal of *ā́ gantana*. Ge further takes *máhas-* as "Feier" (celebration), while Re's "manifestation-de-grandeur" is closer to the root sense of the word. But I see no reason not to take this neut.

s-stem in the standard sense 'greatness' and construe pāda c as an independent nominal cl., as in the publ. tr.

In d *sámanasaḥ* 'of the same mind' replicates the same word in 2b and provides a bit of a ring. Note that in 2 the referents are the human officiants, whereas here it is the gods, with the two groups thus implicitly equated -- an equation facilitated by the similar structures: the two words are in identical metrical positions and both follow a 2nd pl. impv., with *sámanasaḥ* modifying the 2nd ps. subj. Although 'of the same mind' in the first instance means that all members of each group have the same mind, the repetition may imply that the human officiants of vs. 2 and the attending gods of vs. 4 also share the same thoughts.

VII.44 Dadhikrā

Both by number of vss. and by its listing style, this hymn fits the sequence of All Gods hymns in which it is found, though the presence of Dadhikrā among these deities is somewhat puzzling. As noted in the publ. intro., most of the divinities named have associations with the Dawn ritual.

VII.44.3: As discussed in the publ. intro., in the middle of a hymn of utmost simplicity and banality, this vs. -- or a single pāda, c -- is utterly baffling and has given rise to competing interpr. This pāda contains two color terms, *bradhná-* 'coppery' and *babhrú-* 'brown', and a hapax *māṁścatóḥ* (or better *maṃścatóḥ*; see Old): *bradhnám māṁścatór váruṇasya babhrúm*. Most comm. assume that the two color terms refer to horses (see, e.g., Ge n. 3c, also Old), because of the presence of Dadhikrā and because color terms often designate horses. (Cf., e.g., Re "au (coursier) couleur-fauve de Mitra, au (coursier) brun de Varuṇa.") But the introduction of two extraneous horses seems unlikely to me, in a hymn that barely strays from the dawn ritual context.

The old and once widespread interpr. of *māṃścatú-*/ *maṃścatóḥ* is as a cmpd. 'chasing/hiding the moon', with a form of 'moon' still containing an internal nasal and the 2nd member built to √*cat* 'hide' (for lit. see, e.g., AiG III.250, EWA s.v. *māṃścatú-*) -- though this interpr. has generally been replaced by agnosticism about both meaning and deriv. because of the problematic details of the derivation and the uncertainty of the passages containing this form and the related ones (see below). The form in our passage is generally assumed to be a gen. sg. to a *-u*-stem. The identification of the supposed referent given in Re's tr., "Mitra," also has a long history (see, e.g., Old, Ge's n. 3c with lit.) and is due in part to the presence of apparently parallel gen. *váruṇasya* and in part to a chain of semantic assumptions: if *māṃścatú-* means 'chasing the moon', then it can refer to the sun, and the sun in turn can stand for Mitra (see EWA s.v.). But this chain, esp. the last link, is not strong, though the apparent parallelism with *váruṇasya* is admittedly stronger.

Assessing the cmpd is somewhat aided (but not all that much) by the existence of two related words *māṁścatvá-* and *māṁścatva-*, in two nearby vss. in the Soma Maṇḍala, IX.97.52, 54 in the same tṛca. Vs. 52 also contains *bradhná-*. Though the exact sense of the two vss. is obscure, the context is the usual self-purification of soma, with the soma drop in 52 addressed directly and the *bradhná-* "also there, sped like the wind" (*bradhnáś cid átra vā́to ná jūtáḥ*). I tentatively identify *bradhnáḥ* there as the sun or the ritual fire at the dawn sacrifice, and take *māṃścatvé* in the same vs. as a temporal loc. If *bradhná-* is

the sun, that body is copper-colored only at dawn and at sunset; a temporal loc. of *māṃ̆ścatvá-,* if it means ‘hiding/chasing the moon’, would mean ‘at the time of the hiding of the moon, viz. dawn’, a time appropriate to the ritual content of the vs. Returning to VII.44.3 with this ritual context in mind, I suggest that the same elements of the ritual are represented here: the coppery *bradhná-* is the sun, or perhaps the fire (I favor the sun, because the sun is well known as Varuṇa’s spy); the brown *babhrú-* is the soma, as often (IX.11.4, 31.5, etc.). And in my analysis *māṃ̆ścatoḥ* is not a gen. to a *-u*-stem, but rather a loc. du. to a root noun **māṃ̆ś-cát-* and, as in my interpr. of IX.97.52, is a temporal loc. “at the two twilights.” Of course, we should expect this loc. du. to be accented **māṃ̆ś-cátoḥ*, but the non-transparency of the stem could have led it to be reanalysed as a *-u*-stem gen. parallel to *váruṇasya*. Although the cmpd in its literal meaning would only be appropriate to morning twilight, it came to be applied to both. As for *māṃ̆ścatvá- / mā̆ṃ̆ścatva-*, I suggest that they are *-tva*-stem derivatives of this root noun, with simplification of the geminate **māṃ̆ścat-tva-*.

Riccardo Ginevra has recently called my belated attention to Pinault’s 2008 treatment of this same word (“About the Slaying of Soma: Uncovering the Rigvedic Witness,” Ged. Elizarenkova, 353–88). In this extensive and exceedingly careful treatment with comprehensive treatment of the earlier lit., Pinault seriously disputes all previous analyses of the cmpd (esp. 360–64), including the one I maintain above. His most telling objection to that analysis is that the Indo-Iranian paradigm of the ‘moon’ word has no trace of the nasal found in other IE languages, since it has been vocalized in the weak forms of the paradigm and generalized from there (362–63). In order to connect *mā̆ṃ́ś-* with the ‘moon’ word, we must assume that the nasal was preserved in just this form under exceptional phonological circumstances because of the obscurity of the formation. Although I recognize the hazards in this assumption, I am still willing to take the risk. I cannot endorse Pinault’s own suggestion, that the first member is the ‘flesh’ word, the second member was borrowed from a non-Indo-Aryan language “of the Nūristāni type” (383), and the cmpd means ‘flesh-cutting’ and refers to a disguised myth of the killing of soma. The first hypothesis (‘flesh’) is certainly possible, but the other two, esp. the second (inter alia, he gives no etymon or even source language for this borrowing), seem significantly less plausible than the isolated preservation of the nasal in ‘moon’.

Although I would hardly claim that my analysis of the cmpd or of the passage in general is airtight, it does provide an interpr. of the pāda that better fits the hymn: two more divinities (Sūrya and Soma) that the poet is calling upon (*úpa bruve* pāda b), rather than a couple of irrelevant race horses.

VII.45 Savitar

VII.45.1–2: Although Savitar’s role as god of evening, causing the world and its activities to settle down, is alluded to in 1d, his role as rouser of the world at dawn is given equal billing in that pāda (*... ca ... ca*). The more oblique expression in 2d must also refer to this latter role. The sun “cedes his task” of waking and rousing the world to Savitar.

VII.45.2: Both Ge and Re take the aor. injunc. *paniṣṭa* in c as modal, but the aor. injunc. *ánu dāt* in d as general pres. (e.g., “Jetzt sei ... gepriesen; ... ordnet ...”). But there is no

reason that the first needs to be assigned modal value: the temporal adv. *nūnám* can instead draw attention to an immediate past action ("has [just now] been wondered at"). And it seems preferable, if contextually possible, to take the two adjacent aor. injunctives in the same value.

VII.45.3: Klein (DGRV II.102) asserts that *ádha* in d "conjoins the second distich with the first, following an intervening participial phrase" (that is, conjoins ab with cd, the participial phrase occupying c); Klein tr. "And propping apart his broadly encompassing sunbeam he shall give mortal's nourishment to us." Although this seems roughly correct, the dislocated position of *ádha*, not only after the participial phrase of c but after the first, heavy word of d, *martabhójanam*, might have called for more comment. It would be possible to take c with ab -- there are no syntactic obstacles to this: the participial phrase can attach to the nom. subject of ab -- which would situation *ádha* closer to the beginning of the clause it's conjoining (after only one word). But I favor a slightly richer semantics for *ádha* than Klein does: often 'then' rather than just 'and'. And I think it likely here that positioning *ádha* in the last clause of the vs. and in fact in the last clause of the hymn proper) since vs. 4 is a meta-verse), is meant to emphasize Savitar's last and most significant action, the actual delivery of his bounty to us mortals. The particle is found directly before the verb to stress the *action* of granting. With this analysis there is no need to attach c to ab.

VII.45.4: As just noted, this is a meta-summary final vs., referring to the very hymns (*imā́ gíraḥ*) invoking Savitar at the present moment. The 2nd pāda focuses on his hands: *pūrṇágabhastim ... supāṇím* "having full fists [that is, fists full of goods] and good palms." This provides a semantic, but not lexical ring with the beginning of the hymn, where many good things are in Savitar's hand (*háste* 1c). (I would in fact have tr. 4b -*pāṇí*- as 'hand' but used 'palm' instead to make the lexical difference clear in English.) The 'hand' focus is also continued in the two arms (*bāhū́*) in 2ab, though that is so standard an image of Savitar that it may be independent here.

VII.46 Rudra

VII.46.1: This hymn begins with the NP *imā́(ḥ) ... gíraḥ* "these hymns," the same phrase that opened the last vs. of the preceding hymn (VII.45.4). In that hymn it was a nom. pl.; here it is an acc. pl., but its grammatical identity does not become clear until almost the end of the vs., when the transitive verb *bharatā* 'bring' is found in the middle of d, right before the final brief cl. *śṛ́ṇotu naḥ*. The ambiguity of case between the identical phrases in 45.4a and our 1a makes the connection seem closer.

VII.46.2–3: The final pādas of both vss. are semantic variants of each other: "don't hurt our children." In 2d the negative is expressed by the privative on the adj. *anamīváḥ* (*... bhava*) "be without affliction," while 3d contains the stronger and more conventional prohibitive *mā́ ... rīriṣaḥ* "do not harm." The word for 'children' is the fairly rare uncompounded root noun *jā́*- in 2d, replaced by the fuller and more familiar bipartite phrase *tokā́- tánaya*- "offspring (and) descendents."

VII.46.2: The complementary etymological and morphological figure *ávann ávantīḥ* is noteworthy, but I have no idea what "helping/helpful doors" (*ávantīr dúraḥ*) are or do. Perhaps it is an indirect way to refer to the sacrificial offerings humans make to help the gods, in return for the help (etc.) they receive from the gods, in this case Rudra. As Re suggests ad loc. (EVP XV.161), "*dúraḥ* ... s'oriente vers «maison»" and the emphasis in this vs. and the next on the protection of our children and offspring may have invited this allusion to the house.

VII.46.3: The first hemistich contains two occurrences of *pári*, but in fact it should technically have three: the first *pári* at the end of pāda a governs the preceding abl. *divás* in the sense of 'from' (note the close sandhi *divás pári*); the second, in the middle of b, should be construed with both preceding *cárati* and following *vṛṇaktu* and is positioned exactly between the two clauses that contain those two verbs.

I take the hapax voc. *svapivāta* to the lexeme *ápi √vat*, which I interpr. after the manner of Tichy. See comm. ad I.128.2. The intimacy implied by this lexeme ('be/make familiar/intimate') is appropriate to the focus on the household disc. above. My tr. "o you who are our familiar" does not represent the *su-*, but it is difficult to incorporate it without making an already heavy tr. even more so.

VII.46.4: The prohibitive *mā́*, introduced in 3d as a variant of 2d, dominates the first hemistich of this final vs.

VII.47 Waters

VII.47.1: I have deliberately omitted tr. the 2nd enclitic *vaḥ*, found in c.

VII.47.1–2: *devayántaḥ* in 1ab with 3rd ps. referent (see the 3rd pl. verb *ákṛṇvata*) modulates to 1st ps. reference in 2b, also signalled by the verb (*aśyāma*).

VII.47.3: On *svadháyā mádantīḥ* see also I.124.8.

VII.47.4: Note the implicit shift in gender between ab and c: the feminine pl. rel. pronouns *yā́ḥ* (a) and *yā́bhyaḥ* (b) are picked up by masculine pl. *té* in c, which is the subj. of the 2nd pl. impv. *dhātanā*, with the referent explicit in the feminine voc. *sindhavaḥ*, matching the earlier rel. pronouns.

On the difference between the constructions of *√rad* in this vs. and nearby VII.49.1, see comm. ad X.89.7.

VII.48 Ṛbhus JPB [SJ on JPB]

On the intense nomenclatural play in this hymn see publ. intro.

VII.48.1: In the second hemistich I prefer the Old/Ge/Re interpr. of the simile *krátavo ná yātā́m* to that found in the publ. tr. Ge explicitly (n. 1c) suggests reading *krátavaḥ* doubled, with this noun functioning both as the subject of *vartayantu* in the frame and in the simile with gen. pl. *yātā́m*. Since *ná* is blocked from final position (see my "Penultimate *ná* 'like' in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism" [presented at ECIEC July

2024]), the simile may actually consist only of **yātā́ṃ ná* "like (those) of (chariot-)drivers," with *ná* targeting only the gen. I see no reason to supply "horses" out of nowhere as the subject, as in the publ. tr. With *krátavaḥ* as subj. in the frame, the question is then "*whose* intentions?" Ge and Re think they are ours (so apparently Old); I prefer to ascribe them to the Ṛbhus. I would retr. cd as "Let (your) intentions, like those of (chariot-)drivers, make you, inclined (our) way, and your chariot, favorable to men, turn here."

VII.48.2: The rendering of the etymological figure *śávasā śávāṃsi* seems heavy. I would restrict each term to a single Engl. word: "powers with your power."

VII.48.3: At the end of pāda a Gr reads *śā́sāḥ*, against Pp. *śā́sā*, as an acc. pl. to a fem. stem *śāsā́-*. But as pointed out by Old (see comm. ad II.23.12), this stem does not exist, and the Pp. reading should be accepted, as instr. sg. to the root noun. (Re, however, follows the Gr interpr.)

On the basis of the parallelism with 2ab, with *abhí √as* plus etymological figure *śávasā śávāṃsi*, the standard tr. (Gr, WG, publ. tr.; also Th Fremd. 53) supply acc. pl. **śāsáḥ* 'commands' with *pūrvī́ḥ* in the phrase *pūrvī́r abhí sánti śā́sā* "they overcome many (commands) with their command," to create another etym. figure. I do not have anything better to offer (save possibly **púraḥ* 'fortresses'), but I find the expression "overcome /prevail over commands" somewhat odd.

The publ. tr. omits *víśvān*, which skews the interpr. of pāda b.

The form *aryáḥ* appears in both b and c; this form is of course multiply ambiguous morphologically – gen.-abl. sg. / nom. pl. / acc. pl. Although it might in principle be desirable for the two occurrences in this vs. to have the same morphological identity, it is not necessary. In fact I take the first as acc. pl. and the second as gen. sg. In each case this identity is anchored by adjacent forms: *víśvān* in b, *śátroḥ* in cd. In fact, the attempt to make the form in b a gen. sg., as found in the publ. tr. and, somewhat differently in Th (Fremdl. 53), is not persuasive – nor is the WG choice to take the form in b as nom. pl. (though see the n., which recognizes the acc. pl. possibility).

For b I would substitute the tr. "they vanquish all the strangers in the nearness." Contra all the standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG, publ. tr.; Th. Fremdl. 53), I do not think that *uparátāt-* here means 'superiority', despite Aves. *uparatāt-* "Überlegenheit, Superiorität." The other RVic occurrence of *uparátāti* (I.151.5, q.v) does have this sense, but I attribute that to interference from the adv. *upári* 'above'. Our form shows its derivational relationship to the (semantically opposite) adj. *úpara-* 'near(er), low(er)'.

I would somewhat alter the tr. of d to "they will take apart (/deconstruct) the manliness of the stranger (and) rival by their opposition."

VII.48.4: The publ. tr. omitted *víśve* in b. I would emend to "Become all of one accord ..."

I would also slightly change c to reflect the *sám* and the middle voice: "The good ones should jointly give refreshment to us."

VII.49 Waters

VII.49.1: On the difference between the constructions of √*rad* in this vs. and nearby VII.47.4, see comm. ad X.89.7.

VII.49.2–3: Pādas 2c and 3c contain the same three words after the caesura, but with the first two flipped: 2c *yā́ḥ śúcayaḥ pāvakā́ḥ* and 3c *śúcayo yā́ḥ pāvakā́ḥ* (with the last word to be read **pavākā́ḥ* in both instances, as usual's). I do not understand the motivation for the permutation, although each order has a positive and negative feature: 2c puts the rel. prn. in the more usual 2nd position in the pāda, as opposed to 3c, where it is 3rd (though both positions are syntactically acceptable), but the break in 2c (–˘˘) is decidedly less common than the one in 3c (˘˘ –)(see Arnold, *Vedic Metre*, 188).

[VII.50–52 JPB]

VII.50 Mitra and Varuṇa, etc. [SJ on JPB]

On the Atharvan-like contents of this hymn, see publ. intro. Interestingly, there is no entirely parallel hymn in the AV. Re briefly treats this hymn in ÉVP XVI.111. I have no opinions on the nature or identity of the various afflictions, for which see the Zysk references in the publ. intro. (though I have some doubts about his identifications). It contains a number of words not found elsewhere in the RV; even when they appear in the AV, the meanings are not always harmonious.

VII.50.1: On *kulāyáyant-* see my *-áya*-Formations (p. 50). Although this denom. stem is a hapax, it is clearly built to *kulā́ya-* 'nest' (AV+), whose possessive stem *kulāyín-* is found once in the RV (VI.15.16), as well as in AVP XX.20.8.

The stem *tsáru-* is found only here in the RV, but it is clearly derived from the root √*tsar* 'creep'. However, *tsaru-* is found a number of times in AVP (III.39.5 = XII.3.2, XVI.123.1–4), where 'creeping (thing)' seems excluded. In AVP III.39.5 Spiers (diss. 2020: 577–78) tr. as "arrow" (/flèche); in the parallel AVP XII.3.2 Hellweg, Leach, and Zehnder (2022; online) as "shaft [of an arrow]." The AVŚ parallel (V.25.1) reads *sárau* instead, which Wh suggests emending to *śárau*. That the word refers to an arrow or part thereof is clear from context. If AVP *tsaru-* is not simply a phonological variant/deformation of the well-attested *śáru-* 'arrow, missile' (a solution I would favor), the semantic development from 'creeping (thing)' to 'arrow' is challenging to reconstruct – perhaps by way of 'ambush' (< creep up on and surprise). In any case, arrow/shaft definitely does not fit our passage here.

VII.50.2: The stem *vándana-* is found in AVŚ VII.115.2 = AVP XX.18.8 (see Kubisch 2012: 111), where it appears to be some sort of parasitic plant that attaches itself to trees. Once again, this sense doesn't work in our passage; however, a rash (Ausschlag), as suggested by Gr, accepted by Ge and WG, and somewhat endorsed by EWA, could be viewed as a parasitic condition, a "growth" overlaid on the skin. This interpr. seems slightly better than the "eruption" of the publ. tr. and also works better with the verb 'will become smeared' (*déhat*), since rashes visibly spread across the surface, unlike eruptions. I would slightly emend the tr. to "what rash will appear ..." As disc. ad VII.21.5, I separate the *vándana-* found there etymologically and semantically.

VII.50.4: The stem *śímidā-* is found fairly often in the AV and later; for a recent survey see Griffiths (2009 ad AVP VI.23.10). By contrast *śipadā-* is found only here; Mayr. (EWA s.v. *śímidā-*) considers it a phonological variant.

VII.51 Ādityas [SJ on JPB]

VII.51.2: The publ. tr.'s "most straightforward" for *rájiṣṭha-* seems to me to strike the wrong note. I'd prefer "straightest," the usual rendering of this adj., which normally modiifes "path(s)," or – if a moral quality is desired – "most upright," substituting a vertical for a horizontal axis.

VII.52 Ādityas [SJ on JPB]

VII.52.1: As recognized by all the standard tr., at least one form of √*bhū* in the final pāda has the pregnant sense "thrive" that is so common in Brāhmaṇa prose. This is not surprising in a late hymn like this.

VII.52.2: I often render *tóka- tánaya-* as "progeny and posterity," which is somewhat more literal – though I recognize that "kith and kin" is snappier.

In order to harmonize pāda a with the oft-repeated refrain I.94.16 (etc.) *tán no mitró váruṇo māmahantām*, *áditiḥ síndhuḥ pṛthivī́ utá dyaúḥ*, I would slightly change the tr. to "This will Mitra and Varuṇa (and the others) grant to us ..." The second pāda of the just-cited refrain supplies a series of other nominatives that justify the plural verb; here that pāda is absent, and a vague set of others has to be supplied for pl. *māmahanta* and the (probably) nom. pl. *gopā́ḥ* in b – perhaps, per the publ. tr., the Vasus, on the basis of pāda d. On the stem *māmah-* see comm. ad II.17.7; the stem belongs to √*maṃh*, not √*mah*, *pace* Gr and others.

On *énas-* as 'offense, transgression' versus JPB's 'guilt, blame', see comm. ad V.3.7. I would substitute here the tr. of the nearly identical pāda VI.51.7: "Don't let us pay for the offense against you produced by another."

On the apparent opt. *bhujema* with *mā́* see comm. ad IV.3.13 with ref. to KH's explanation.

VII.53 Heaven and Earth

VII.53.1: The *té* that opens the 2nd hemistich is ambiguous: it can be nom. pl. m., modifying *kaváyaḥ*, or acc. du. f., providing the object of *puráḥ ... dadhiré*.

VII.53.2: Unusually, this vs. requests and depicts physical movement of Heaven and Earth, which is conceptually awkward, given that Heaven at least has a fixed position at a great distance from our ritual ground. I have argued elsewhere ("The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas," Staal Ged., 2016) that one of the likely reasons for the eclipse of the inherited divinity and original head of the pantheon Dyauṣ Pitar "Father Heaven" was his inability to move about the cosmos and especially, in conformity with the newer ritual model, to come *to* our sacrifice rather than having the oblations of that sacrifice filter up to heaven. This is one of the few

passages in the RV where his presence at the sacrifice is urged, and only a little thought is required to reveal it as odd.

Ge takes *sádane* as du. ("den beiden Sitzen der Wahrheit"), and in favor of this interpr. is the fact that its final vowel is pragṛhya in the Saṃhitā text (*sádane ṛtásya*, not **sádana ṛtásya*, as in IV.42.4), as Old points out. Nonetheless, I take it, with Re and Lü (607–8) (and Gr implicitly), as a loc. sg. in the usual phrase. As Lü points out (608), gods are never themselves "seats of truth" but are located in such seats.

VII.54 Lord of the Dwelling Place

VII.54.1: On *práti √jñā* see comm. ad III.45.4.

VII.54.1–2: On *práti √juṣ* see comm. ad IX.92.1.

VII.54.2: The voc. *indo* 'o drop' in b is incongruous in this context, and as Ge points out, the 1st hemistich seems to have been adapted from a Soma hymn, where 'drop' would be appropriate. He adduces I.91.19 (c: *gayasphā́naḥ pratáraṇaḥ ...*) and 12, whose 1st pāda also contains *gayasphā́naḥ*, though the matches are not exact and neither of the cited pādas contains *indo*. However, *gayasphā́na-* is found only in those two passages and in our vs.

VII.55 Sleep

As noted in the publ. intro., the first vs. does not belong with the rest of the hymn but rather with the preceding one, VII.54, to Vāstoṣpati, the Lord of the Dwelling Place. However, as also noted there, this is not just a product of wrong division of hymns: VII.55.1 is in a different meter from VII.54, and VII.54 ends with the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain, which is always the final pāda of a hymn. Moreover, as Old points out, VII.54 has three vss. and follows correctly on the three-vs. hymns VII.51–53, while an additional vs. would break that sequence. Old suggests that the single vs. VII.55.1 originally formed its own hymn and that the rest of VII.55, with 7 vss., is an addition to the original collection (Anhangslied).

VII.55.1: In addition to the voc. *vāstoṣ pate* that repeats the three vs.-initial vocc. *vā́stoṣ pate* in VII.54, this vs. has other similarities to VII.54, esp. VII.55.1: *amīvahā́* 'destroying affliction' echoes 54.1 *anamīváḥ* 'without affliction', as *āviśán* 'entering' does 54.1 *svāveśáḥ* 'easy to enter'; sim. *sákhā* 'companion' and 54.2 *sakhyé* 'companionship'. Note also that pāda c *sákhā suśéva edhi naḥ* is identical to I.91.15; I.91 is the Soma hymn that VII.54.2ab seems to have been partially based on. In addition, pāda b is identical to VIII.15.13b and IX.25.4a, both of which are addressed to Soma (on Soma as the addressee in the former, see comm. ad loc.). I do not quite understand the Soma/Vāstoṣpati connection.

VII.55.2: The target of the simile in pāda b, 'spears', does not precede the simile marker *iva* and in fact is as far as it can be from it in a pāda of only 8 syllables: *vī́va bhrājanta ṛṣṭáyaḥ*. This arrangement may have resulted from an attempt to keep metrically unfavorable *bhrājante* out of the cadence.

On the refrain *ní ṣú svapa* and the present stem *svápa-* see my "Sleep in Vedic and Indo-European" (KZ 96 [1982/83], esp. 8 n. 3).

VII.55.3: The hapax voc. *punaḥsara* may be a word play with *sārameya*. Bollée (*Gone to the Dogs in Ancient India*, 43) tr. "recessive one," indicating that the dog is in retreat. But the rest of the context suggests an aggressive dog on the attack.

On the intens. *dardar-* here, see Schaeffer (136), who cites a very similar Avestan passage.

VII.55.4: On √*sas*, again see my 'sleep' art. cited ad vs. 2.

VII.55.8: Note the two hapax cmpds with loc. 1st member, *proṣṭhe-śayá-* and *vahye-śayá-* versus *talpa-śī́van-* (*-śī́varī-*), with stem form in 1st member and a different 2nd member belonging to the same root √*śi* 'lie'. On *proṣṭha-* see KH (StII 13/14 [1987]: 129–34 = Aufs. III.855–63), who analyzes it as *pra-úṣ-tha-* from the lexeme *prá* √*vas* 'spend the night away from home', with the developed meaning 'camp bed' – perhaps 'cot' would work better here. As for *vahyá-* he sees it as something "to be conveyed', a place of rest that can be carried or pulled; hence the standard tr. 'litter' works well.