Commentary X.61–191

X.61–84

This next section of X consists of paired hymns, each pair attributed to a different poet, save for X.75–76, which clearly form a pair but are ascribed to different poets. The first three pairs (X.61–66) all consist of hymns to the All Gods, but of very different styles.

X.61–62

Acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, the poet is Nābhānediṣṭha Mānava, but see the publ. intro. of X.61 for my view of the source of the name. Both hymns are dedicated to the All Gods, but are of very different levels of complexity. Note that Re does not treat these two hymns in his Viśve Devāḥ fascicles, but provides comments (but no tr.) in EVP XVI.

X.61 All Gods

On the structure and contents of this devilish hymn, see the publ. intro., as well as the elaborate intros. by Old and Ge., though I differ from them on many points – and remain quite uncertain about many details of my own interpr.

The poet's name in the headnote to the publ. intro. should be corrected to Nābhānediṣṭha. The erroneous spelling is also found in the HvN headnote.

X.61.1: This vs. sets the tone for the rest of the hymn by posing a number of puzzles that elude solution.

We can begin with the deictically announced "Rudrian formulation" (*raúdram ... bráhma*), whose presence in the immediate circumstances is underscored by the annunciatory *idám* (*itthā́*). It is not obvious what is Rudrian about it (but see below), though both Old and Ge make attempts to account for it. The adj. is found also in vs. 15, there modifying the Aśvins, so one might argue that the "Rudrian formulation" here is one addressed to the Aśvins. But the Aśvins are not a presence in this part of the hymn. A more productive approach, partly flg. Ge, is to note that in the later Vedic versions of the incest myth, with Prajāpati and Uṣas as the main participants, it is Rudra who punishes the offender (see my Hyenas, pp. 288–97). The incest story occupies vss. 5–8 of our hymn, and the presence of this myth in the hymn might account for *raúdra-*. In particular, in vs. 7 the gods, concerned about the brutal rape, "begat a/the sacred formulation" (*janayan bráhma*), presumably to guard against such behavior. To me the most plausible interpr. of *raúdra-* is that, in the context of a brahmodya (signalled by *śácyām antár ājaú* in b), a "Rudrian formulation" is one that exhibits the aggressive hostility often characteristic of that god, which the poet can deploy to win the contest. The antagonistic relationship between Turvayāṇa and Cyavana is quite clear in vs. 2. Note that in 3cd Tūrvayāṇa's verbal skill is likened to arrows that he successfully aims at a target, another war-like Rudra-type image.

The first hemistich lacks a verb – or appears to, on the assumption that the *s*-stem form *gūrtávacāḥ* is a masculine nom. sg. and *raúdram ... bráhma* is a neut. acc. We could avoid the need to supply a verb by taking *gūrtávacāḥ* as a neuter; other *s*-stem cmpds modifying neuters occasionally show the apparent masc. *-āḥ* rather than neut *-aḥ*, esp. pāda-final as here (see Lanmann, Noun Infl. 599 and comm. ad VII.24.2 and II.31.5). We could then have a nominal clause "here is a ... formulation of welcome speech ..." Old considers this (and Re suggests that the cmpd modifies *bráhma*, but as a masc., puzzlingly), but Old rejects this interpr. for the same reason I do, that an unequivocal masc. splv. *gūrtávacastamaḥ* modifies the poet in vs. 2c. (He is

also concerned about the referent of *asya* in 1c.) The masc. splv. in vs. 2 may be considered an ex. of poetic repair, making the masc. gender of *gūrtávacāḥ* explicit. Given that we need to supply a verb, I suggest a form of √*kṛ*, evoked by the *kr-* forms in the vs., etymologically unrelated *krátvā* (b) and etymologically related but somewhat detached adv. *krāṇā́* (c).

Pāda b is one of the few clear mentions (as signaled by *śácyām antár ājaú*; see above) of a poetic contest or brahmodya in the RV, an institution that other interpr. are more apt to see in RVic contexts than I am.

On *krāṇā́* see comm. ad I.58.3.

The cmpd. *maṃhaneṣṭhā́ḥ* poses problems in both members. On the one hand, what is the case form of *maṃhane* and to what stem does it belong? On the other, what is the case and number of *-ṣṭhā́ḥ* and what does it modify? To begin with the 2nd member, Old, Ge, and the publ. tr. take the cmpd as modifying neut. *yád*, which picks up *bráhma* from the main clause. Ge (n. 1c) explains it as a masc. form for the neuter (as is sometimes the case with root nouns in *-ā́-*; see comm. ad VII.8.6). Old simply says "... habe ich als Neutr. übersetzt; doch auch Mask. möglich," without saying how he finesses the neut. or which masc. he might attach it to. By contrast Scar (652–53) suggests that it is an acc. pl. m. with the consonant-stem ending *-as* < **m̥s* added to the root-noun stem (depending on the chronological stage, presumably: **-aH-m̥s* or **ā-as*), modifying *hótṝn*. Although in this hymn with its many puzzles and blind alleys, a muddled neut. sg. form, as represented in the publ. tr., would not be surprising, I am somewhat attracted to Scar's interpr. and suggest an alternate tr. "(a formulation) that ... will effectively guide across ... the seven Hotars (who are) standing ready for liberality." Scar's interpr. of the 1st member is also preferable to the standard, which takes *maṃhane* as the loc. of a putative short *-a*-stem **máṃhana-*, though the only stem attested (mostly in the [admittedly ambiguous instr.] is fem. *mámhanā-*. Scar suggests rather that *maṃhane* here is a dat. infinitive, which allows a more appealing interpr. 'standing ready for liberality' than the loc. 'standing in liberality'. For what this all might mean, see below.

There is also another alternative, not represented in any of the available interpr. as far as I know – that *maṃhaneṣṭhā́ḥ* is a nom. sg. masculine (the easiest morphological interpr.), modifying the poet referred to in ab, and that *yád* is not a neut. picking up *bráhma*, but a subordinating conj. This would yield another alternative tr. "when he, standing ready for liberality, will effectively guide ..." If the cmpd modifies either the poet (as I just suggested) or the formulation (in the standard and publ. tr. interpr.), "standing ready for liberality" (with Scar's datival 1st member) would express the poet's / formulation's readiness to *receive* liberality; if it modifies *hótṝn*, it could refer to the Hotars' readiness to dispense liberality, though it could also have the meaning suggested for the other two interpr.

Gr and Ge take *pakthé* as a PN, as the stem certainly is in VII.18.7, VIII.22.10, 49.10, but Old reports the suggestion of Wackernagel that it is an ordinal, 'fifth', here, construed with loc. *áhan*. So also KH (KZ 65 [1979] = Aufs. I.188–89). Re tentatively accepts this suggestion, though Scar's tr. maintains the PN. Mayr (EWA, also PN, both s.v.) also accepts it. The "seven" of "seven Hotars" invites a numerical interpr. of the preceding phrase, even if the referent of "the fifth day" is obscure.

I do now wonder if the second hemistich has astronomical reference. Perhaps "two fathers / parents" here does not refer to the poet's own parents, but, as often, to Heaven and Earth (e.g., I.159.2), and "the Seven Hotars" could be a variant of the Seven Ṛṣis (*saptarṣi*), who are later identified with the constellation Ursa Major. If *pitárā* refers to Heaven and Earth, it could set the stage for the incest episode starting in vs. 5. As for the application in this vs. the poet and/or his

formulation would be assisting at an astronomical transit associated with "the fifth day." This is all very speculative, and I can't get any further. But it would be unusual for the human parents of the poet to be the beneficiaries of his poetic activity, esp. along with a gaggle of Hotars. Again, if the Hotars are heavenly beings, not earth-bound priests, they might be "standing ready to (dispense) liberality," if we accept Scar's view of the cmpd as an acc. pl. Unfortunately, however, this speculative interpr. seems far from the poetic contest depicted in 1ab and 2.

X.61.2: As disc. in the publ. intro., in my view this vs. characterizes the verbal products of the losing (Cyavāna) and winning (Tūrvayāṇa) opponents in the brahmodya as metaphorical liquids – Cyavāna's as mere add-ins to soma, Tūrvayāṇa's as gushing semen (itself often a metaphor for soma). In taking *rétaḥ* 'semen' as metaphorical, I part ways with Old, who thinks it's the real substance, used in a ritual to produce offspring. And in general my interpr. of this vs. differs both from Old's extensive analysis of it and from Ge's tr. and notes.

To begin with, the standard interpr. is that the first hemistich has Cyavāna as subject, the second Tūrvayāṇa. But note that *cyávānaḥ* appears only at the beginning of pāda b, while pāda a begins *sá íd*. While it is certainly not impossible that *sá* anticipates the mention of Cyavāna in the next pāda, the more natural way to interpr. *sá íd* in context is as a reference to the subject of the previous vs., the *gūrtavacāḥ* poet (1a), who in 2c will be further specified as *gūrtávacastamaḥ*. This assumption underlies my interpr. of the vs., and it solves several problems in the construal of pāda a that the others must make heavy weather of.

First: in order to have the part. *vanván* 'winning' modify Cyavāna, other interpr. encounter difficulties of both syntax and sense. As to the latter, since Cyavāna seems actually to come out the loser in this match, any "winning" he does (by that interpr.) needs to be of a qualified or ironic type. Moreover, √*van* 'win' does not take the dative, except to express the beneficiary of someone else's win; certainly the object won is not in the dative, as the standard interpr. of the syntax here requires. The supposed dat. complement leads Gr to create a unique def. of √*van* just for this passage ("11) jemandem [D.] wozu [D.] verhelfen") and Ge also to stray far from the usual sense of √*van* ('sich bemühen' + DAT: "indem er sich um eine unsichere Gabe bemühte"). Note that the following two vss. each contain a verbal form of √*van*: *vanuthaḥ* (3b), *vavanvā́ṃsaḥ* (4d), and these three forms should at least not contradict each other.

My interpr. avoids both these difficulties. Given the triumphant tone of the 2nd hemistich concerning Tūrvayāṇa, pronouncing him a winner in pāda a is unproblematic. I take *vanván* in absolute sense ("winning / a winner") without expressed object (cf. pf. part. *vavanvā́ṃsā* in the same usage in 4d). As for the dat. phrase *dānā́ya dábhyāya*, I begin with the fact that dat. *dānā́ya* is frequently used as an infinitive / quasi-infinitive "to give, for giving"; cf. e.g., I.180.5 *ā́ vāṃ dānā́ya vavṛtīya ... góḥ* "Might I turn you two here to give / for giving (of) a cow." In fact it is several times found as the complement of √*maṃh* 'be ready (to give), be magnanimous' (VIII.52.6, 61.8; including in the next hymn, X.62.8 = VI.45.32). Now recall the cmpd *maṃhane-ṣṭhā́ḥ* in the immed. preceding vs. and Scar's interpr. of *maṃhane* as a dative infinitive. I tr. that cmpd. "standing ready for liberality" (see above). In our vs. here I suggest that we carry over the *-sthā́-* 'standing (ready)' and construe it with the syntactically independent dative *dānā́ya*. The extra twist here is that I take the other dat., *dábhyāya* not as a deprecatory characterization of the type of gift (like Ge's "eine unsichere Gabe" [with an unjustified extension of the sense of √*dabh*] or Re's "mesquin"), but as characterizing an animate ('who can be outwitted') and the dative agent of the infin., of the familiar type (*índrāya pā́tave*, etc.): "for the *dábhya*-one to give." The referent of *dábhyāya* is the defeated Cyavāna, and Tūrvayāṇa is

waiting for Cyavāna, whom he outwitted, to give him what is owed. The gerundive *dábhya-* is found only twice in the RV, and in its other occurrence, X.108.4, it also has animate/personal reference, to Indra "who can (not) be outwitted." It does not refer to things such as a paltry gift (as others take it here); it is not a synonym of *dabhrá-*, *pace* Re.

Pāda b describes Cyavāna's losing tactics: he measured out his vedi with *sū́da*-s. In the publ. tr. I render the word as "'sweet' (dregs)," but see comm. ad VII.36.3, where I come around to favor Pischel's Beisatz, the ingredients added to soma. The point here would be that Cyavāna used only auxiliary materials, not the real substance itself. In terms of a verbal contest, this could mean poetry tricked out with flourishes but without true force, eloquence, or insight. I would now slightly change the tr. to "with sweet admixtures."

By contrast, Tūrvayāṇa's product is the most forceful and vital subtance of all, namely semen (*rétas*). In the metaphorical sacrifice in which he and Cyavāna are competing the *rétas* can stand for soma, as opposed to the add-ins that Cyavāna employed: for the identification of soma as *rétaḥ*, see, e.g., I.164.35. In the verbal contest *rétas* can represent well-formulated words that reflect *ṛtá-* and produce results. And of course in the account of the divine incest myth that follows in this hymn *rétas* is actually semen.

On the problematic *itáūti-*, see comm. ad VIII.99.7.

X.61.3: This vs. enlarges on Tūrvayāṇa's verbal triumph, with his skill not only defeating Cyavāna but also attracting the Aśvins. The second hemistich uses the more familiar trope of words/praise as arrows shot at the target of the praise (see, e.g., my 2020 "The Aim of Praise" [Fs. Lamberterie]) in place of the more jarring eloquence-as-semen of 2d. This arrow image may also harken back to vs. 1 and the Rudrian formulation, which I suggested is meant to evoke the hostility inherent in a verbal contest.

My identification of the unnamed referents in this vs. follows Ge: the 2nd du. in b is addressed to the Aśvins (so also Old, flg. Pischel), who are also the addressees in the next vs. In cd Tūrvayāṇa is the referent of both the rel. *yáḥ* and the gen. demon. *asya*, though Pi takes Indra as the subject of cd (see Old). The loc. pl. phrase *yéṣu hávaneṣu* in pāda a is shorthand for *yásya hávaneṣu*, again with Tūrvayāṇa as referent of the gen.

With Old (but not Ge) I take the *mánaḥ* simile with *vípaḥ* 'inspired words', not with the Aśvins. And unlike both Old and Ge I think *śácyā* 'with skill' must refer to Tūrvayāṇa's skill, not the Aśvins'. The verbal contest (*ājí-*) in vs. 1 was a contest "in skill" (*śácyām*), and it was through his skill that T. won it. I would now slightly alter the tr. to better integrate this instr.: "... inspired words, like thinking sharp with skill."

On *áśrīṇīta* see Narten, "Ved. *śrīṇā́ti* ..." (KZ 100 [1987]: 281–82 = KlSch 351–52).

X.61.4: As indicated in the pub. intro., I consider this vs. to be a direct quote of Tūrvayāṇa's invocation of the Aśvins; note the 1st sg. verb *huve* (b) and the two forms of enclitic *me* (c). This 1st ps. reference contrasts with the 3rd ps. narration of vss. 1–3 and brings this section of the hymn to a close. As a welcome change, most of the vs. is straightforward.

The black female among the ruddy females is of course Night among the Dawn cows, at a time when the "early-coming" Aśvins are on their way to the sacrifice.

The one problem in the vs. is the final word *ásmṛta-dhrū*, specifically the root affiliation of the 2nd member and the meaning of the whole. There are two older competing views of the root affiliation. Starting with Sāy. (see also Old), *-dhrū* has been connected with *druh* 'deceive'. Although this derivation makes (sort of) reasonable semantic sense, it encounters two formal

difficulties: the initial aspirate *dh-* and the loss of the root-final consonant. To account for this, a two-step process is envisaged: the root of course has two underlying aspirates (**dhrugh-*), with the first ordinarily dissimilated by Grassmann's Law. But the nom. sg. would be, and in fact is, in this very hymn, *dhruk* (vs. 14 *ádhruk*), with the first aspirate surfacing when the second loses its aspiration. The dual form in our verse then results from "abnormer Abfall des Endkonsonanten" (AiG II.2.33; see AiG III.326). But the loss of the root-final would be unusual indeed, and the route to getting a dual in *-ū* to an original root noun in final consonant would be quite tortuous. To start with, we should expect a dual to the unmutilated root noun to be **-druhā*. The consonant to be lost is not, in this form, an "Endkonsonant." Moreover, in the expected dual, the root-final remains an aspirate so that the root initial is a plain *d* by Gr's Law. The only paradigmatic form that could show aspiration on the initial and lose a final consonant, to produce an apparent stem **dhru-*, is the just-cited nom. sg. *dhruk*, but it is precisely this form that doesn't lose its final consonant in this same hymn. But let us assume that was the immediate source: still our problems are not over. If we had a putative intermediate root noun stem ending in short *-u dhru-*, produced by the loss of the nom. sg. ending, it should add the empty *-t* found in other root nouns in short resonants. Only if such a stem were analyzed as containing a *suffixal -u-* could we escape the adding of the *-t* and get a dual masc. in *-ū*. If, by contrast, the result of the loss of the final consonant was (by compensatory lengthening?) **dhrū-*, we should expect a dual masc. in *-ᵘ*vā*. Thus, getting the form we have from a root noun cmpd in *-druh-* requires considerable butchery. The alternative root affiliation is scarcely better. Wh (Rts) tentatively lists it under √*dhvṛ*, *dhur*, *dhru* 'injure', as short-vowel *dhru* (with ?); KEWA also classifies the form here (s.v. *dhvárati*). Although the initial aspirate would no longer be a problem, the lack of appended *-t* remains an issue. A third way was suggested by KH (StII 5/6 [1980] 95 = Aufs. 757; accepted in EWA s.v. *DHVAR*), that *dhru-* (and related forms) belong to a separate root √**dhru* 'deceive', related to (/extended into) the more familiar *√*dhru-gh*. This does not solve the lack of *-t*, but that turns out to be a problem with several forms in this hymn (*sabardhúm* vs. 17, *raghudrú* vs. 17). More from exhaustion than a deep conviction of its rightness, I adopt the KH solution. For further disc. on this form and related problems in this hymn, see Scar 279 and 226 n. 309.

X.61.5–8: These vss. relate (or allude) to the story of the incest of Heaven / Sūrya and his daughter, Dawn, found widely in the Brāhmaṇas with Prajāpati as the male figure (see my Hyenas pp. 289–302) and glancingly alluded to elsewhere in the RV (I.71.5, 8). No names are named in our passage, but as indicated in the publ. intro., I think the unifying topic of this hymn is Dawn, and therefore it is her story being related here – *pace* Ge (n. 5), who tentatively suggests that a different incest may be meant.

X.61.5: The cmpd *vīrákarmam* is by accent, and sense, a bahuvrīhi: 'possessing the manly work', a euphemism for the penis; see Gr, Old, Re. It is surely the subj. of *práthiṣṭa*. By contrast Ge takes it, apparently, as a tatpuruṣa ("die Mannesarbeit") and as the obj. of *iṣṇát* ("nach der Mannesarbeit verlangend"). Note the nonce thematization of the neut. *-an*-stem *kárman-*, presumably starting from first cmpd members in *karma-*. The thematization in this context was surely facilitated, perhaps caused, by the fact that *-karmam* is followed by a vowel-initial word, and the *-m* avoids a hiatus between expected *-n*-stem neut. **vīrákarma* and *iṣṇát*. The other two examples of them. 2nd member *-karma-* in the RV, both also late, are not amenable to the same interpr., though there are other factors favoring thematization: *deva-karmébhiḥ* (X.130.1) and *viśvá-karmeṇa* (X.166.4); see comm. ad locc. But see the nearby adverbial *ṛtekarmám* in X.55.7

and disc. there.

With Old I supply ‘semen’ as obj. to the part. *iṣṇát*; the same participle elsewhere takes a liquid as obj.: I.181.6 *pūrvī́r íṣaḥ ... mádhva iṣṇán* ‘dispatching many refreshing drinks of honey.” As was just noted, Ge instead takes *vīrákarmam* as its object and assigns the meaning ‘desiring’ to the participle. Acdg. to him (n. 5a) *iṣṇā́ti* “crosses” with other roots √*iṣ*, but in fact no forms with nasal have the ‘desire’ sense, only ‘send, dispatch’.

The referent of *yásya* in pāda a is *náryaḥ* in b. Although neither *vīrá-* nor *nṛ́-* (and derivatives) is specialized for male-as-sexual-being, the presence of these two words so close together creates an atmosphere of sexual virility.

In b the rapist pulls out his penis, which has already ejaculated. The ppl. *ánuṣṭhitam* modifies the gapped ‘penis’. The not particularly common lexeme *ánu* √*sthā* generally means ‘follow, attend upon, stand beside’; for some disc. see Scar (644–45). My “attending upon” in quotation marks is meant to convey a somewhat euphemistic sense, but I now wonder if *ánu* √*sthā* in this context might be the equivalent of the current term ‘stalking’ for unwanted invasive attentions of a male to a female.

Note that pāda-initial *ánuṣṭhitam* somewhat echoes *práthiṣṭa* in the same position in pāda a.

The second hemistich essentially paraphrases the first, esp. pāda b. The verb *ā́ vṛhati* ‘tears out’ doubles *ápauhat* ‘pulled out’ but in the more vivid present tense. The past part. *ánubhṛtam*, again modifying the gapped penis, echoes *ánuṣṭhitam*, but again more vividly – or more graphically: *ánu* √*bhṛ* in the RV and AV is erotic slang. See my 1981 “A Vedic Sexual Pun” (pp. 59–60) and for an unambiguous passage AV XI.5.12 *bṛhác chépó ’nu bhū́mau jabhāra* “he *ánu jabhāra* his lofty penis in/on/at the earth.” The question is how to translate the idiom. In my 1981 art. I suggest ‘penetrate sexually, stick (one’s penis) in’ and tr. AV XI.5.12 “he stuck (his) great penis in the earth,” which is similar to Whitney’s somewhat more polite “has introduced in the earth a great virile member.” In Hyenas (295–96 with n. 290) I tr. the form in our passage with “what (had been) thrust in.” But I now think it is difficult to get from the literal meanings of the preverb + verb root to ‘thrust in’, and I also think that leering euphemisim is more characteristic of the usage than clinical description. The rendering “brought to bear” in the publ. tr., again in quotes, seems better, as being both less literal and more menacing, though in English it has no erotic flavor that I know of.

The unextended imperfect to √*as*, *ā́ḥ* (i.e., underlying *ās*), is notable here. Is *ā́ ánubhṛtam* a rough-and-ready functional pluperfect “had been brought to bear”? For further on this impf. form, see comm. ad X.85.6–12.

The 2nd hemistich also presents a syntactic problem. The phrase *kanā́yā duhitúḥ* straddling the pāda break can be either gen. or abl., but it makes most sense as an abl. with ‘tears out’, as represented in the publ. tr. and Ge’s “Er reisst es von der jungfräulichen Tochter zurück.” But by word order it should belong in the subordinate *yád* clause, since the *yád* precedes it. Ge (n. 5cd) recognizes the problem, suggesting it’s a mixture of two constructions. It is possible to take the phrase as a genitive loosely construed with *ánubhṛtam* (something like “what had been brought to bear of [=for, with regard to] the maiden”), but an ablative with the main clause verb is far more satisfactory. It may simply be that the six-syllable phrase was too unwieldy to position it in its own clause, whereas the slight (if illicit) preposing of the neut. rel. *yád* allowed the two-word phrase to fit the metrical space. I’m not happy with this explanation, but I’m reluctant to give up the ablative.

X.61.6: This vs. is relatively easy to decode, and it is notable that the English euphemism “make

love" (for sex) is closely replicated by *kā́maṃ kṛṇvāná-* in b.

The difficult word in this vs. is *manānág*. In the publ. tr. I render it as "a little," flg. Ge's tentative "ein wenig (?)," which itself follows Sāy.'s *alpam* and assumes some kind of connection with Epic/Classical *manāk* 'a little' – a connection that is difficult to motivate in detail (though see Re's vague sketch of an attempt). There is a competing, very different analysis, represented already in Gr: that it is a root-noun cmpd in *-naś*. This is the interpr. favored by Old, with √*naś* 'disappear' (etc.), rather than √*naś* 'reach, attain', modifying *rétaḥ*. (Ge [n. 6c], in recognizing the root-noun-cmpd interpr., entertains the possibility that *-naś-* belongs to 'reach, attain' and suggests a gloss 'die Absicht erreichend'.) Old first suggests a sense 'sich der Aufmerksamkeit entziehend' (escaping attention), but produces a second, and to me more plausible, sense, that the discharge of the semen "die Erregung verschwinden lässt." The 1st member would be *manā́-*, which generally means 'zeal' or the like, but could certainly shade into 'energetic excitement' and be euphemistically applied to penile erection. This would require transitive-causative semantics for the root noun *-naś* ('cause to disappear' rather than just 'disappear'), but this is also necessary for what seems to be an undoubted example of such a cmpd, *jīva-náś-* 'destroying life/living beings', in MS I.4.13 (63: 3–4), where it characterizes an oblation (*ā́huti-*) that falls in the wrong place. That passage brings up another problem, however: the form in the MS is nom. sg. with a final in retroflex *-ṭ* (*jīvanáṭ*), while our nom. sg. ends in a velar (*manānák*). Of course root nouns in final palatals show both finals (*-ṭ*: *víṭ* to *víś*; *-k*: *dṛ́k* to *dṛ́ś-*) and the data are messy. I would expect a retroflex here, as in the 3rd sg. s-aor. *avāṭ* (√*vah*) and 3rd sg. root aor. to the homonymous root √*naś* 'reach', *ā́naṭ*. But a velar isn't beyond the realm of possibility, nor is the interpr. of *manānák* as containing such a noun. I therefore tentatively suggest an alt. tr. "the two left behind semen, which dissipates excitement." For a summary of the problem see Scar (282–83), who, however, comes to no conclusions.

That *sukṛtásya yónau* refers to the ritual ground is clear from the appearance of the same phrase in III.29.8, of the place where Agni is to situate the sacrifice. As noted there, suffix-accented *sukṛtá-* has been substantivized and the tr. here should be corrected to "in the womb of good work."

X.61.7: Once again, part of this vs. paraphrases what went before. The sprinkling of the semen in 6cd (*rétaḥ ... níṣiktam*) is repeated in 7b *rétaḥ ... ní ṣiñcat*. But the description is more violent and the agency made clear. In vs. 6 the two "going apart, left behind" the semen, as if the semen were a product of both male and female and mutually and tranquilly deposited. Here the father brutally "springs on" his own daughter, and he is the subject and agent of the VP *rétaḥ ... ní ṣiñcat*. (Because the lexeme is the same in 6d and 7b, I should have tr. it identically: I would now substitute 'sprinkled his semen down upon the earth").

HPS (B+I 45, see 44 and 47) takes *kṣmayā́* as instr. with *saṃjagmānáḥ* ("sich mit der Erde vereinigend"), indicating that the Earth was the object of the rape. But though we lack another instr. to construe with the middle participle, this interpr. is surely wrong on grounds both of content and of form. In the other versions of the tale, the female is Dawn; we would hardly expect Earth here, because she and Heaven are joint parents, not daughter and father. Moreover, though it does no doubt have an instr. ending, *kṣmayā́* is always used adverbially.

As discussed above (ad 1ab), I consider the formulation (*bráhma*) begotten here to be the same as (or a model for) the "Rudrian formulation" (*raúdram ... bráhma*) in vs. 1, namely a formulation with the hostile power associated with Rudra, enabling its deployer to overcome his enemy. As noted there, in the Vedic prose versions Rudra is sometimes named as the avenger of

the rape depicted here. In our vs. I think the gods create the formula to be used against the violator and also create the being who is to carry out the vengeance. But I do not think this latter is Rudra (despite Ge's n. 7d); instead I nominate Agni, who, in his guise as Svarbhānu, is the avenger in many versions of this myth (see my Hyenas, esp. 364–73). It would make sense that the gods should fashion Agni out of the semen spilled on the ritual ground since that is Agni's domain; moreover, in the sg. the epithet *vrata-pā́-* is most frequently used of Agni (see comm. ad X.32.6), and *vā́stoṣ páti-* "Lord of the Dwelling Place" can be an alternative lexical realization of Agni's regular epithet *gṛhápati-* 'Lord of the House(hold)'. (On the use of this term [almost] exclusively for Agni, see my 2019 "The Term *gṛhastha* ...," pp. 8–9.) As for the other RVic occurrences of the phrase, the identity of *vā́stoṣ páti-* in V.41.8 is unclear, but could be Agni; in VIII.17.14 it is probably Indra; and in the other RVic occurrences (in adjacent vss., VII.54.1–3, 55.1) it seems to name the "personified guardian spirit" of the household. These occurrences seem irrelevant to the solemn use of the term here.

The 3rd pl. act. *janayan* here is one of only two such forms found in the RV, for expected re-marked *janayanta*; the other is in X.66.9 (q.v.). See my 1979 *-anta* replacement article, esp. p. 154, which treats the distribution of 3rd pl. forms to the transitive stem *janáya-*. Though the Pp. gives augmented *ajanayan*, the augment would have to be elided, and I am tolerably certain that in fact the form is underlyingly injunctive.

X.61.8: This vs. is the last one treating the incestuous rape, before the transitional vs. 9. It depicts (bc) the desperate attempts of the daughter to get away from her attacker, an episode found in some versions of the Vedic prose tale, as well as the rueful direct speech of her thwarted father in d.

In pāda a the father is compared to a bull in a contest (*ājaú*, returning from vs. 1b) throwing off foam (*phénam*). In the real-world analogy, the foam presumably results from the bull's straining hard work and the sweat thus produced, but in the frame the "foam" surely stands for the semen that the father keeps shedding.

Contra Ge, who take the subject in b to be the father, I take it to be the daughter, going in every direction to evade her rapist. The nom. sg. *dabhrácetāḥ* can be masc. or fem.; there is no other sign of the gender or identity of the subject of *ait*. The collection of preverbs with this verb, *ā́ parā́ ... ápa* "hither, thither, away," seem to be summed up by the adv. *smát* 'altogether', indicating the almost random zigs and zags of her attempts to escape. Her desperate state of mind is also conveyed by *dabhrácetāḥ*, which I render 'heedless' – that is, 'possessing little consciousness / attention'. In its other occurrence I tr. the cmpd. 'small-witted'; here it does not reference stupidity but rather distraction: "out of her wits," "not having her wits about her" would be appropriate.

The depiction of Dawn's flight continues in c. The lexeme *párā* √*vṛj*, found here in the root noun cmpd. *parāvṛ́j-*, needs to be distinguished from the much more common *pári* √*vṛj*, lit. 'twist around', but regularly meaning 'avoid'. The sense of *párā* √*vṛj* is equally both additive ('twist aside / away') and idiomatic ('shun'), and it does not differ substantially from *pári* √*vṛj* in its idiomatic sense ('shun' versus 'avoid'). The root noun cmpd elsewhere has passive semantics: 'the outcast', i.e., the one shunned (see I.112.8, II.13.12, 15.7), but here I see the active semantics more common with root noun cmpds, 'turning aside, shunning'.

The two words *padā́* and *dákṣiṇā* are taken together by Ge and tentatively by Re. Ge takes them as referring to the "southern direction" (zu den südlichen Orten) towards which the outcast daughter runs. Re, pointing out that 'southern' isn't attested for *dákṣiṇa-* till the AV (not a

particularly strong argument, given the short chronological span), renders the phrase rather "au pied droit," with a question mark. But the two words do not have to form a phrase (as Old points out). I take *padā́* as instr. sg., but *dákṣiṇā* as nom. sg., referring to the priestly gift (Dakṣiṇā), personified as a Gift Cow. Uṣas is regularly associated with the Dakṣiṇā, since the priestly gifts were distributed at the Dawn Sacrifice in RVic times. That the Gift-Cow is meant here is likely also because *adakṣiṇá-* 'without a Dakṣiṇā' is found two vss. later (10d). Here I think Dawn is the personified (or bovinized) Dakṣiṇā, and, as a cow, she flees (*sárat*) on foot (*padā́*). This detail plays on the fact that Dawn is elsewhere said to be 'footless'; see VI.59.6 ... *apā́d iyám pū́rvāgāt padvátībhyaḥ* "This footless one has gone in front of the footed (cattle)," an esp. telling passage because it contrasts footless Dawn with the cattle, which have feet (sim. I.152.3). In her panic Dawn runs away on foot, having transformed herself into the Gift Cow that is associated with her. This transformation is perhaps the original model for the transformation of the victim into a red doe (*rohít-*) in several of the Vedic prose versions (see my Hyenas, 290–93 with n. 276).

Pāda d contains the direct speech of the father, recognizing that his daughter has escaped his clutches. The word *pṛśanī́-* is used of the 'caresses' the father wishes to bestow on his daughter also in the other RVic treatment of this incest story, I.71.5.

X.61.9–11: These next three vss. all begin with *makṣū́* 'right away', which marks them as a unit, even though vs. 9 also tidies up (some of) the loose ends from the preceding narrative. The second pair of vss. (10–11) begin almost identically and are more closely related in content than they are with 9:

10a *makṣū́ kanā́yāḥ sakhyáṃ návagvāḥ*

11a *makṣū́ kanā́yāḥ sakhyáṃ návīyaḥ*

The first three words and half of the fourth are the same. The close relationship of the two vss. does not make them easier to interpret.

X.61.9: This vs. depicts the birth of Agni. As noted above, ad vs. 7, I consider Agni to be the creature the gods produced after the rape, from the semen spilled on the ritual ground – Agni being suggested by the epithets *vratapā́-* and *vā́stoṣ páti-*. This vs. treats the production of Agni in more detail, though without naming him: the only occurrence of the stem *agní-* in this vs. is in a simile in pāda b, referring to fire the substance.

In pāda a "trampling" (*upabdíḥ*) is compared directly to the chariot horse (*váhniḥ*), though we might expect the horse to be in the gen., parallel to *prajā́yāḥ*. Ge (n. 9a) attributes the nominative case of *váhniḥ* to the reversion of nouns in similes to the nominative, a doctrine that I hope I laid to rest in 1982 ("Case Disharmony in RVic Similes," IIJ 24). I consider our passage to be simply a bold disjunction, with a quality compared directly to a possessor of that quality. Note that the simile particle is wrongly positioned, before *váhniḥ*; it is unlikely that the preceding word *makṣū́* is part of the simile, *pace* Old, since it is an adverb and, furthermore, also opens the next two vss. without involvement in a simile.

The "trampling" of the offspring=Agni probably refers to the crackling of the kindled fire.

I consider b to incorporate a pun on the homonymous stems *ū́dhar-*/*ū́dhan-*, both 'udder' and 'cold' (for the latter see comm. ad VIII.2.12 and EWA s.v. *ū́dhan-* and *ū́dhar*), with one stem used in the frame, one in the simile. The primary reading here is acc. 'udder', where Agni takes his seat – the udder presumably being the fireplace. But in the simile *agníṃ ná nagnáḥ* I take it as a loc. 'in the cold'. The simile is very close to VIII.2.12 *ū́dhar ná nagnā́ jarante* "Like

naked (ones) in the cold they stay awake." The simile in our passage is esp. clever because it contains *agní-* designating fire the substance in the acc., while the subject of the frame is the unnamed Fire the god.

In the second hemistich the two occurrences of the root-accented agent noun *sánitar-* with acc. objects *idhmám* and *vā́jam* (c) respectively are contrasted with a suffix-accented *dhartár-* without complement. Tichy (*-tar*-stems, 297–98) considers our passage as something of an exception to her interpr. of the accentual difference, claiming that *sánitar-* here designates a habitual agent, but *dhartár-* an occasional one. It seems to me rather the reverse, with *dhartā́* indicating the role that Agni was born to exercise, and *sánitā* incidental feats that Agni accomplishes. The rendering of *sánitā* + ACC as a straight past tense ("he gained the kindling ...") in the publ. tr. is misleading, however. I would change to "he is one who gains the kindling wood and one who gains the prize." This interpr. conforms to the general characterization of the two accent types by Benveniste (*Noms d'agent ...*, 11) that the root-accented type designates "l'auteur d'un acte" and the suffix-accented one "l'agent voué à une fonction." However, the data are quite messy and, for any general characterization, require a generous, indeed over-generous, amount of special pleading.

The stable role of 'upholder' in d may be emphasized by the intensive (i.e., habitual or frequentative) nominal *yavīyúdh-* 'ever battling'.

X.61.10: There is much disagreement about the referents and sense of this vs. – understandably – though there is general agreement that it has to do with the Vala myth. My own interpr. is quite tentative. The most solid identification in the vs. is that of the *kanā́-* (also in 11), who is surely Dawn, since the same word was used of the incest victim in 5c. Since the Navagvas are associated with the myth of the Vala cave, it seems likely that the story has shifted from Dawn's rape to Dawn's imprisonment in the Vala cave, from which the Navagvas attempt to free her. Since elsewhere (see, e.g., I.62.4, V.45.7, 11) the Navagvas open the cave with sound, with song, it seems likely that "speaking the truth" (*ṛtáṃ vádantaḥ*) refers to this activity and the "yoking of truth" (*ṛtá-yuktim*) to their employment of this spoken truth in the opening of the cave.

The identifications become more challenging in the 2nd hemistich, esp. of *dvibárhas-*, *gopá-*, and *ácyutā(ḥ*?). As for the first, Gr takes it as a nom. pl., referring to the Navagvas; Ge as gen. sg. referring to the cave; Old as gen., tentatively supplying *rāyáḥ*. By contrast, I take it as referring to Dawn, who is called *dvibárhas-* in V.80.4. Both Ge and Old think the *gopá-* is the/a Paṇi, while I take it as the Vala cave itself. If I am correct, the phrase "protector of doubly exalted (Dawn)" is ironic, since the "protection" is actually imprisonment (consider the double usage of the root √*rakṣ* 'protect / guard').

The interpr. of *ácyutā* is complicated by the ambiguity of its form: out of sandhi it can either be *ácyutā* (so Pp.) or *ácyutāḥ*. The former is far more likely, and here I think Ge and Old have the right idea: that it refers to the solid rocks, the fastnesses, of the cave; cf. VI.22.6 adduced by Ge. Now, as to *adakṣinā́saḥ* 'without Dakṣiṇā(s)', modifying the Navagvas – Ge (n. 10cd, flg. Ludwig) thinks this refers to the Paṇi's theft of the cows that the Navagvas brought to distribute at their sacrifice. I think rather that this refers directly back to 8c, where Dawn transformed herself into the Dakṣiṇā cow and ran away from her rapist. She has now been confined in the Vala cave and the Navagvas are "without the Dakṣiṇā" – namely without Dawn herself. They attempt to "milk" her out of the rocks that form the cave: their aim is to recover the imprisoned Dawn.

X.61.11: It gets worse! This vs. is well-nigh impenetrable, and I am fairly certain that the interpr. given in the publ. intro. and publ. tr. is wrong or at least incomplete. Nonetheless, the continuity of the vss. (if we can dignify it with that term) suggests that the milking the Navagvas attempted at the end of vs. 10 was successful, and the semen/soma/milk of vs. 11 is the tangible result.

A major clue is, or should be, that the second hemistich is identical to I.121.5cd, a hymn attributed to Kakṣīvant, who is also named in our hymn in vs. 16. But unfortunately I.121 does not give us much help, since, like much of Kakṣīvant's oeuvre, it is bafflingly obscure. In I.121.5 the reference is to soma, the referent of *te* is Indra, but – significantly – it is in the context of the Vala myth, which is treated in the two preceding vss., I.121.3-4. Because our vs. is also found in the middle of a Vala context (vss. 10, 12–13), I now think that vs. 11 should be interpreted in that context as well and that my claim that vs. 11 concerns, at least in part, the birth of Agni (see publ. intro.) is incorrect. Instead I think that this vs., like I.121.5, concerns the soma that Indra acquired to give him the power to open the Vala cave. Although soma is not usually a necessary ingredient in the Vala myth (as opposed to the Vṛtra myth), in I.121.4 it clearly is: Indra is said to have opened the cave and freed the cows *asyá máde* "in the exhilaration of this (soma)." (Though the word *sómasya* is absent, *máde* makes the reference of *asyá* to soma inescapable.) And the following vs. (the relevant vs. 5) tells how Indra acquired this soma: brought to him by his parents, probably Heaven and Earth (ab), and acquired by sacrifice by unnamed but plural agents (cd = our cd). Other accounts of the Vala myth can also involve Indra's possession of soma, e.g., VI.17.1–6.

Now let us examine our vs. in a bit more detail, first noting that although, unlike the second hemistich, the first is not identical to I.121.5ab, it has points of resemblance, particularly the opening of b *rā́dho ná rétaḥ*, which is very like the opening of I.121.5b *rā́dhaḥ surétaḥ*. In I.121.5 *surétaḥ* 'having good semen' modifies *páyaḥ* in pāda a, which is also identified as a 'bounty'. The whole phrase, "the bounty, the milk consisting of good semen," refers to soma. This set of superimpositions allows us to identify the "semen, like a bounty" of our b with the milk, *páyaḥ*, in d and to consider them also all to be soma. But it's a bit more complicated, in that in pāda d the "milk" is produced by a different, and feminine, being, the "ruddy one who gives sap as milk" (*sabardúghāyāḥ ... usríyāyāḥ*). The fem. *usríyā-* 'ruddy' is always used of cows, or items conflated with cows, namely Dawns/light. So here we may be dealing both with milk=soma and milk=light, the latter produced by the Dawn confined in the Vala cave. The phrase *sabardúghāyāḥ ... usríyāyāḥ* also has to be considered in connection with the phrase *sabardhúṃ dhenúm* in vs. 17.

However, contra the publ. tr., I no longer think that the semen is identical to the "truth" (*ṛtám íd*) that immediately follows it in pāda b. Instead I think this is a separate goal (of three) of the verb *turaṇyan*: "they hastened to the fellowship of the maiden, to the semen, (and) to truth itself." In the immediately preceding vs. the Navagvas are speaking truth (*ṛtáṃ vádantaḥ*) and their goal is the yoking of truth (*ṛtáyuktim*), namely (see comm. ad vs. 10 above) the use of their spoken truth to open the cave. Here they seek the imprisoned maiden, the semen = soma for Indra to use, and their own true song also to use in the opening of Vala.

The verb in this hemistich, *turaṇyan*, is generally taken as transitive (Gr, Old, Ge, HPS [B+I 46], Re), but other forms of this stem (incl. in I.121.1), as well as the derived adj. *turaṇyú-*, are intransitive (*pace* Re ad loc. and EVP XV.166), and I see no reason to impose a transitive sense here. The verb is simply a more insistent rephrasing of *agman* in the preceding vs. (10b), with the same goal, *kanā́yāḥ sakhyám*.

In the second hemistich, identical to I.121.5, "your gleaming legacy" is again, surely, the

soma. The introduction of a 2nd sg. *te* is surprising in our context, though it fits I.121.5 very well: there Indra is addressed in the immed. preceding vs. (I.121.4), and the first pāda of 5 begins *túbhyam*, which anticipates *te* in c. Old believes that our hemistich has been mechanically adapted from I.121.5 and implies that we need not pay attention to the *te*; HPS (46–47) by contrast thinks that the abrupt introduction of a 2nd ps. reference to Indra in the context of the Vala myth is not surprising, and I am in agreement (though not with the rest of his interpr.), esp. because it's likely that Indra (or his alter ego Bṛhaspati) is the unnamed speaker in the next vs., 12b.

Indra's "gleaming legacy" is, once again, the soma – and it is not, in my opinion, something Indra has left behind, but rather what was left behind for him. As I remark ad X.132.3, *rékṇas*- "is several times used of what we gain from the gods at the sacrifice (e.g., I.31.5, 121.5, VI.20.7); in keeping with its etymology (from the root *ric* 'leave'), it can be viewed as what was 'left behind' by the gods at the sacrifice." In my view, in our verse the unnamed subjects of *ā́yajanta* acquired the soma by their sacrifice, for the benefit of Indra. I think it likely that they are the Navagvas.

Although the vs. remains very obscure, I feel I have a better handle on it than in the publ. tr. and I would now substitute the following tr. for the one found there: "Right away they hastened anew to the fellowship of the maiden, to semen [=soma], which was like a bounty, (and) to truth itself -- / (the semen/soma), your blazing legacy, which they acquired through sacrifice, (and) the milk of the ruddy one who gives sap as milk."

X.61.12: This vs. appears to deal with the departure of the cows from the Vala cave and its aftermath, and it introduces an unnamed single speaker (b), probably either Indra or Bṛhaspati, in addition to the bards (*kārávaḥ* c), who are surely the Navagvas we have been dealing with for several vss. and who serve as the unnamed subjects of pāda a. The vs. is hardly pellucid, however, and once again I think that the publ. tr. has gone seriously astray – with misinterpretations that I will attempt (no doubt not entirely successfully) to remedy here.

Our problems begin with the Saṃhita form *víyutā*, which is multiply ambiguous. The Pp reads *víyutā*, but *víyutāh* is equally possible in this sandhi context. The latter would be the nom. pl. m. of the past part. *ví-yuta*- 'separated' and agree with the subj. of injunc. *budhánta*, presumably the Navagvas. (Nom./acc. pl. fem. is also possible but probably contextually excluded.) The former, *víyutā*, has two possible morphological analyses, as neut. pl. to the same past part. (or fem. nom. sg., though this also seems excluded contextually) or as loc. sg. to the *ti*-stem abstract *víyuti*- 'separation' (as in IV.7.7). All three possibilities have entered into the discussion. In fact Old weighs all three (in order, -*tā* neut. pl. ppl., -*tāḥ* masc. pl. ppl., -*tā* loc. sg. -*ti*-stem) without making a decision. Gr. takes it as m. pl. ppl.; Lub lists it under the -*ti*-stem. But insofar as there's a standard view, it is as a neut. pl. — so Sāy., Ge, HPS (B+I 200) — an analysis that is the hardest to fit into the passage, since it requires supplying a neut. pl. referent. All three just-mentioned interpr. take the referent to be the place(s) where the cows were kept, for Ge and HPS the fastnesses of the Vala cave, with Ge adducing the neut. pl. *ácyutā* 'the immovable ones' in 10c, referring to the walls/rocks of the cave. In Schmidt's tr. "Als sie danach erkannten, dass (die Festen) vom Vieh getrennt waren." Though I originally took *víyutā* as the loc. to the -*ti*-stem (hard as that may be to get from the publ. tr.), I now think that the most likely interpr. is as the masc. nom. pl., modifying the Navagvas, subjects of *budhánta*. They become concerned that the cattle, departing from the cave, had also left them behind. The reassuring voice – and action – of Indra/Bṛhaspati intervenes at that point.

I am somewhat disturbed by the sequence of tense between pāda a, with an apparently preterital injunctive *budhánta*, and b, with present *bravīti*. I suggest that this combination of tenses is meant to remove this vs., which seems to depict the situation *after* the opening of the Vala cave, from the narrative of the besieging of the cave, which occupies vss. 10–11 and returns in vs. 13. This perturbation of chronology is also signaled by *paścā* 'afterwards' in pāda a.

Pāda b also contains the problematic form *vaktárī* (read with short *-i* in Pp). The morphological analysis of these *-tárī* forms (e.g., *kartárī* I.139.7, *etárī* V.41.10=VI.12.4) is disputed; see also disc. ad V.41.10. Lanman (Noun infl. 426) considers them simply locatives to the *-tar*-agent noun with metrical lengthening. Old (ZDMG 55.302=KlSch 761 and Noten ad loc.) is inclined to follow the view that they are nom. sg., and he vigorously disputes the opinion that they are locatives or locatival infinitives. AiG III.205 (with considerable lit.) tentatively opts for nom./acc. sg. neuter, though allowing the possibility of locative, while AiG II.2.673 pronounces them "unerklärt ... bis jetzt." Tichy (*-tar*- 59–60) takes them as locatives, but to verbal abstracts. She tr. our passage "So spricht (Bṛhaspati), der beim Reden freigebig schenkt." Although in some instances her abstract value works reasonably well (see *etárī* V.41.10=VI.12.4), in others the agentive sense seems to be preserved. I would claim that for our passage. Here *vaktárī* serves almost as an improper loc. absolute with the part. *rárāṇaḥ*: "bestowing (gifts) as he talked / when talking." As for the long final *-ī* of these forms, much as I dislike the convenient invocation of metrical lengthening, Lanman does make a good case for the metrical positions of the forms that show *-ī*, and it may be that as their morphological identity lost clarity, the integrity of their final was no longer guarded.

The *íti* in b seems to mark the following pāda(s), c and probably d, as direct speech. There Indra/Bṛhaspati speaks of himself in the 3rd ps.

The publ. tr. of pāda c suffers, I now think, from imposing a "moral" rather than material sense on *vasutvā́* and *ánehāḥ*. To begin with the first, the tr. 'goodness' for *vasutvā́* is misleading. Though this stem (*vasu-tvá-*) occurs only here, the extended stem *vasu-tvaná-* is found 4x in the RV, always in the sense of a mass of material goods. Esp. nice, because of the presence of voc. *vaso* referring to Indra, is VIII.1.6 ... *vaso, vasutvanā́ya rā́dhase* "o you who are good for goods and largesse," where *rā́dhase* anchors the phrase in a material context. There is no moral or ethical nuance. In our passage the gen. *vásoḥ* most likely refers to Indra/Bṛhaspati, as *vaso* in VIII.1.6 refers to Indra, and the phrase refers to Indra's bestowal of a collection of material goods: "by the mass/collectivity of goods of the good one."

We must also re-evaluate the sense of *anehás*-. Throughout the publ. tr. I have generally rendered this word as 'faultless, blameless', flg. EWA s.v. (and KEWA III.656), based on a suggestion of Hoffmann's. Although I do not dispute KH's etymology or assessment of the general meaning, I think that, at least in English, the glosses I've used are misleadingly located in the moral sphere. In a number of passages – incl., I'd claim, this one – the word falls into the physical sphere, meaning 'without defect, without flaw, without lack, wanting nothing'. The word is seldom used of animate beings, the referents most likely to have a moral dimension – only III.9.1 (Agni), V.65.5 (we), VIII.75.10 (Heaven and Earth), VIII.18.5 (Ādityas), X.61.22 (patrons, in our hymn; see below), as well as in our vs. Instead it applies a number of times to the shelter or protection we pray the gods to extend to us (VI.50.3, VIII.18.21, prob. VIII.67.12, 31.12); what we want is shelter that is physically without gaps or weak spots, not shelter that is morally blameless. Similar are the passages referring to paths (I.129.9, VI.51.16=VIII.69.16); again a path is probably morally neutral, but it should be physically without flaw, to allow easy passage. The use of the adj. with "chariot" (VIII.22.2) falls in the same category. Verbal products

like *mántra-* (I.40.6) and *stúbh-* 'rhythm' (III.51.3) could of course be 'faultless', but what is more likely meant is that they are perfectly composed, without flaw. Although the usual trajectory in semantic change is from the physical to the moral, it may be that this word went the other way, partly encouraged by the rhyme form *anenás-* 'without offense / transgression'. When, in our passage, the bards are said to be *anehā́ḥ*, the point, I now think, is that they lack nothing, are in want of nothing, because Indra/Bṛhaspati bestowed gifts of goods upon them, in fact probably the cows that had left the cave. The bards were at risk of suffering a *material* lack, but Indra/Bṛhaspati made it up to them. This statement in pāda c follows on the gifting depicted in pāda b.

Our form *anehā́(ḥ)* is problematic for another reason: morphology. The stem is otherwise an *s*-stem, but if *anehā́(ḥ)* belongs to this stem, it can only be a nom. *singular*. This is in fact how Sāy. takes it, modifying Indra, the putative subject of the next pāda. But not only does the pāda break intervene, but removing *anehā́(ḥ)* from pāda c leaves the *kārávaḥ* with nothing to do: there is no verbal or nominal predicate available to them. I'm afraid we must take it as a nonce nom. pl. masc., as if to an *-a*-stem and chalk it up to the penchant of this poet for deforming morphology.

The subj. of d is presumably the same as that of c, Indra/Bṛhaspati, and identical to the referent of gen. *vásoḥ* in c. I would refine my tr. of the verb *viveṣṭi* from 'exert control over', for which I now see no evidence, to 'toil/labor for', as in VIII.75.11 *kuvít sú no gáviṣṭaye, ágne saṃvéṣiṣo rayím* "Surely you will toil for wealth for us, for our quest for cattle, o Agni." The point in that passage and this one is that the god labors to procure material gain for his dependents.

The last major problem in the vs. is how to interpr. *úpa kṣú*. The pāda-final monosyllable is concerning. Sāy. takes it as an abbreviation for *makṣú* and Gr as a deriv. of √*ghas* 'eat', hence 'food'. But the standard current view is that it derives from *paśú-* 'cattle'; see EWA s.v. The question is whether it should stand as an independent monosyllable. Ge considers it short for *kṣumát* and tr. "aus Vieh bestehende," modifying *dráviṇam*. Another, and to me more persuasive, view is that it forms a cmpd with preceding *úpa*: **upakṣú* like *purukṣú*, a view going back to Ludwig and Bloomfield, rejected by Old, positively entertained by Re. This would also take care of the problem posed by *úpa*. The root √*viṣ* does not otherwise appear with the preverb *úpa*, though Gr creates the lexeme for just this passage, and it is positioned oddly for a preverb in tmesis, neither adjoining a metrical boundary nor right after the verb. I therefore accept the cmpd. interpr., which involves only the erasure of one accent in the Saṃhitā text. This minor emendation should have been marked with an asterisk in the tr.

In the first hemistich note the echoic phrases beginning both pādas: *paśvā́ ... paścā́* and *íti bravīti*. Note also that, assuming that *kṣú* is derived from *paśú-*, the vs. begins (*paśvā́*) and ends (*kṣú*) with forms of *paśú-*.

After this thoroughgoing rethinking of this vs., I would substitute the following translation:

When afterwards they became aware that they had been separated from the livestock, he [=Bṛhaspati or Indra] speaks thus, bestowing (gifts) as he talked / while talking.

"By the goods of the good one the bards are lacking nothing. He labors for all movable property, *up to / including cattle."

X.61.13: This is the last vs. of this section of the hymn, and in my opinion it (still) concerns the besieging of the Vala cave – though there are some problems with this interpr. and it is not the standard view (not that there really is a "standard" view). One of the reasons I consider this vs. a

continuation of the Vala narrative is the verb *agman* at the end of pāda a, which matches *agman* ending 10b, the first real vs. of the Vala narrative. The subjects in both cases are, in my view, the Navagvas, and the verb match marks an internal ring.

As is well known, in the Vala myth Indra and his helpers (generally the Aṅgirases, of which the Daśagvas and the Navagvas [here] are subgroups) often open the cave by "sitting a 'session'" (the ritual known later [already AV] as a *sattrá*); see, e.g., III.31.9. The repetition of *(-)sad-* in a variety of forms hints at this ritual reference: *pariṣádvānaḥ ... sádanto nārṣadám*. The first two, in the nom. pl., refer to the Navagvas. The problem is *nārṣadám*, which is, in my opinion, a red herring that has distorted the interpr. of this vs. This vṛddhi stem is elsewhere a patryonymic ('son of Nṛṣad') that seems to refer to Kaṇva in I.117.8, who is also identified as "son of Nṛṣad" (*káṇvaṃ nṛṣádaḥ putrám*) in X.31.11. But Kaṇva is generally favorably viewed, and if *nārṣadám* here is the obj. of *bibhitsan* 'they desired to split', he would seem to be an enemy. This apparent contradiction has generated much, mostly fruitless, discussion, which I will not reproduce here. I think a way out of the dilemma can be found if we 1) do not take *nārṣadá-* as a PN (whether of Kaṇva or someone else) and 2) do not construe this acc. as obj. of *bibhitsan*. A related stem *nṛ-ṣádana-* is used of 'sitting(s) of men', that is, ritual sessions, and I now think that *nārṣadám* here falls in the same semantic sphere and that it's the cognate acc. with *sádantaḥ* "sitting (a siege) like/related to a 'session of men'." In other words, the tactic the Navagvas use to open the Vala cave both is, and is like, a (more benign) ritual session. This leaves *bibhitsan* without an expressed object, but the object (Vala) is readily supplied from context. I take *purū́* as I did in the publ. tr., as an acc. of extent of time, "for many (days)." In standard śrauta ritual a *sattra* is 12 days or more. I would now emend the tr. of the first hemistich to "They came just then as its besiegers; sitting (a siege) like/related to a 'session of men' for many (days), they strove to split (Vala)."

Although the Vala myth and the Śuṣṇa myth tend to be independent, the two are intertwined in I.121, the Kakṣīvant hymn that has clear connections to this one (see comm. above ad vs. 11). In I.121.10 we have Śuṣṇa associated with something *súgrathitam* 'well-knotted', like *śúṣṇasya sáṃgrathitam* here.

As Ge (n. 13c) indicates, *(ví)* √*vid* is used several times of discovering and disclosing the *márman-* 'vulnerable spot' of an enemy, and that must be what's meant here. In I.121.10 it is Śuṣṇa's *ójas-* 'power' that is 'well-knotted' (*súgrathitam*).

X.61.14–15: The opening of the Vala cave and the vanquishing of Śuṣṇa having apparently been accomplished in the preceding vs., the hymn now (re)turns to the sacrifice, where the Aśvins are welcomed in vs. 15. The Aśvins are of course associated with the Dawn sacrifice, so the Dawn thread that runs through this hymn is continued.

X.61.14: With Old, I interpr. the two *utá*'s in a and c as connecting the two naming constructions in a and c, rather than seeing each as internally conjoining pieces of its pāda (as in KH Aufs. 19: "Dessen Name 'Glanz' ist <u>und</u> an dessen dreifachen Sitz sich die Götter ... Agni ist dessen Name <u>und</u> Jātavedas" [my underline]). Ge takes the first *utá* as 'auch' and the second as conjoining *agníḥ* and *jātávedāḥ*, but given that they take identical positions in their respective pādas (after #X *ha nā́ma*), they ought to have parallel functions. The two *utá* are oddly positioned for what I see as their function, but that seems a minor problem in this hymn.

X.61.15: The Aśvins are called *rudrā́* a number of times (e.g., I.158.1); what exactly this is

meant to convey I do not know. Although the presence of the rare vṛddhi stem *raúdra-* (RV 3x) twice in this hymn (also vs. 1, modifying *bráhma*) is suggestive, esp. with *gūrtáye* (b) echoing *gūrtávacā* (1a), I do not think that there is a strong conceptual link between the two occurrences. For the one in vs. 1, see disc. ad loc.

arcimántā, rendered 'who possess the chant' in the publ. tr., can also mean 'possessing rays/beams' (Ge "strahlend"), and both are probably meant. The 'ray/beam' reading would of course be appropriate to their connection with the Dawn sacrifice.

Ge supplies a nom. subj. "ich" for the infinitival *yájadhyai* ("... will ich ... verehren"), on the basis of parallelism with I.122.4 (adduced by Old; see Ge n. 15ab), which has a nominative subject. His parallel is drawn from the Kakṣīvant hymn immediately following Kakṣīvant's I.121, which shows important points of contact with our hymn (see above). Nonetheless I see no reason to supply an extraneous subject here, since the infinitive(s) can easily be taken as passive.

I take *gūrtáye* as a dative (pseudo-)infinitive parallel to *yájadhyai*; Ge, by contrast, takes it as a separate dative expression "um mir Beifall zu erwerben." Although there are no other dative forms to *gūrtí-* to support its infinitival status here, it appears parallel to *yajñá-* in IX.105.1 ... *yajñaíḥ* ... *gūrtíbhiḥ*, which suggests the connection. And it is worth noting that *gūrtí-* in its other three occurrences is something originating from men and destined for the gods, not, as Ge has it, something a mortal might acquire for himself.

The part. *rárāṇā* picks up *rárāṇaḥ* in 12b, used of Indra/Bṛhaspati distributing gifts, probably cows, to the Navagvas. The myth provides the model for the ritual.

X.61.16–19: On my interpr. of these much-disputed verses, which differs substantially from those of Old and Ge, see the publ. intro. I am not at all certain that I am right, but am tolerably certain that Old and Ge are not.

X.61.16: As indicated in the publ. intro., I take this vs. as relatively conventional praise of his royal patron by the poet of the hymn – praise that he will soon qualify. The near-deictic *ayám* that opens the vs. suggests that the person in question is present at the sacrifice, which favors my interpr. that it is the poet's patron and the sacrificer (*yáṣṭā* 17a), the sponsor of the ritual.

Ge (n. 16b) takes pāda b as a "schönes Bild" – the subject overcomes all obstacles through his own power ('being/creating his own bridge': *svásetuḥ*). Ge is no doubt correct, but I think that crossing the river is meant not only metaphorically but literally, referring to the Āryas' winning of new territory by crossing the boundary rivers, a feat also often attributed to Indra as leader. Here the king would be assimilated to Indra.

Ge (n. 16c) thinks the king makes Kakṣīvant and Agni both tremble because, as *vípra*s themselves, they fear that the king/*vípra* will out-perform them poetically. I think the point is rather that he inspires them to create poetry praising him, and poetic inspiration as often sets the poet atremble (as the word *vípra-* indicates). In my view Kakṣīvant is either the poet of this hymn, or, perhaps more likely, the poet identifies himself with Kakṣīvant and has adopted some of his lines, as we saw above.

On *raghudrú* as probably not a root-noun cmpd see Scar 243–44, though see his somewhat different opinion p. 226 n. 309. The lack of the empty *-t* characteristic of standard root nouns to roots in short resonants (expect *-*drut-*) is a tipoff.

X.61.17: As I discussed in the publ. intro., I think that the poet follows his praise of his royal patron in vs. 16 by cutting him down to size. Specifically, he hints that the king is not producing

the gifts due to the poet and ritualists, even while the poet himself is doing his job by roping in (almost literally) the gods Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman. The poet's description of his successful attraction of the gods in cd is close to menacing.

As I said in the publ. intro., I think *dvibándhu-* means that the king is related to both gods and men—or thinks he is. It is this term that set both Old and Ge to constructing an elaborate backstory and family tree, and I do not think it should bear the weight Old and Ge put on it.

The agent noun *yáṣṭar-* 'sacrificer' in my opinion refers to the same figure as the technical term *yájamāna-*, namely the sponsor of the sacrifice, not a priest. It is not clear that *yájamāna-* has entirely acquired its technical meaning in the RV.

The "sap-yielding milk-cow" (*sabardhúṃ dhenúm*) echoes the *sabardúghāyāḥ* of vs. 11, which we identified as the Dawn in the form of a cow, confined in the Vala cave. Despite her circumstances, she produced milk (*páyaḥ*). Here I think the poet is indicating that a cow (or "cow") assimilated to the sap-yielding cow in vs. 11 is available for the sacrificer to milk. The cow may be the Dakṣiṇā cow herself, the source of the necessary priestly gifts for the poet and other ritual personnel. Though she potentially yields "sap," she has not yet given birth (i.e., she has not produced the gifts), and it is the sacrificer/king's job to milk her. This ritual task harkens back to the mythological depiction of the Navagvas coming to the Vala cave and, though lacking the Dakṣiṇā, seeking to milk the cave (vs. 10). They seem to have been successful (vs. 11), a good model for the king's activity here.

In the 2nd hemistich the poet is properly performing his task. Ge (n. 17c, flg. Sāy.) takes the verb *vṛñjé* as a 3rd ps., but there's no reason to impose an anomalous morphological analysis on it, when the morphologically proper 1st ps. works better in context. As I said above, there is something faintly threatening about the poet's account of what he does: he "enmeshes" (*sám ... vṛñjé*) Mitra and Varuṇa with his hymns. Verbal forms of the lexeme *sám* √*vṛj* are found only twice in the RV; in the other occurrence (VII.3.4) it refers to Agni's encircling / encompassing food with his jaws. The noun *saṃvárga-* (VIII.75.12, X.43.5) is used of booty or winnings that have been completely encompassed and acquired; the root noun *saṃvṛ́j-* (II.12.3.) is used of the winner who does the encompassing. In all these passages there is a sense of dominance, which I think is also found here: the gods have been captured by the poet's hymns, perforce.

But the hymns also act as protective defenses, *várūthaiḥ*, for all those within them, including those same gods, so that the hint of menace is countered by the positive protective association of *várūtha-*, which always has the sense of a protective defense, sometimes found with *śárman-* 'shelter' (IV.55.4) and *chardís-* 'id.'. For the association of *várūtha-* with verbal products, cf. VIII.101.5 *varūthyàm ... chándyaṃ váca stotrám* "a speech, a pleasurable, protective praise-song" and VIII.67.3 *ukthyàṃ várūtham* "protection worthy of hymns."

I would now no longer separate Mitra-Varuṇa in c from Aryaman in d and construe each with a different instr. and would therefore emend the tr. to "when I enmesh Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryman with hymns (that are) preeminent defenses.

X.61.18: On my general interpr. of this vs., which is taken very differently by others, see the publ. intro. As I say there, I take the subj. of this vs., the *sūríḥ* (patron), to be the same as the king in vs. 16 and the sacrificer/sponsor in vs. 17. The adj. *tádbandhuḥ* opening the vs. aligns the subj. with the *dvibándhuḥ* of 17a. Ge (n. 18a) suggests rather that the subject here is a relative of the *yáṣṭar-* in 17.

This leads us to the question of the referent of 2nd sg. enclitic *te*. For Ge, it's Agni—also Re, flg. Gonda; further HPS, 47–48; see also Scar 253–54. They also take *te* as an improper

locative (e.g., Ge "auf dich im Himmel"). Citing the *te* in 11c and the voc. *indra* in 15b, Old tentatively suggests Indra. I suggest instead that it is the poet and that the *te* is a gen. dependent on *dhiyam* in the cmpd. *dhiyaṃ-dhā́-*: "setting your insight in heaven." The patron is dispatching the poet's own *dhī́* to heaven as part of his sacrificial offering. My suggestion creates several problems. First, by my interpr. the poet was the 1st person speaker of the previous hemistich (17cd), and so we must switch to a 3rd ps. narrator addressing the poet in the 2nd ps. I can point to numerous abrupt changes of person in the RV in support, but I am still uneasy with this particular one. Further, it is not usually the patron's task (or privilege) to manipulate or physically position the verbal offerings in the sacrifice, but rather the poet-creators. The referents of this cmpd *dhiyaṃ-dhā́-* in I.67.4 and IV.45.4 appear to be the poets themselves – though as Scar points out, the referents of other occurrences are different and the meaning of the compound "schwankt je nach Kontext." Moreover there are other passages in which the patrons do seem to provide the motive power to the poet's productions. See, e.g., I.77.4 ... *yé maghávānaḥ ... iṣáyanta mánma* "our benefactors who propel our prayers at length." As many times elsewhere in the interpr. of this hymn, I am uncertain about my own choices, but fairly sure that the ones prevalent in the lit. are less justified. In any case the publ. tr. would be easier to interpr. if I had identified the referent.

The word *nā́bhānédiṣṭha-* is taken by most as a PN, and that may be one of its values here. But I think its full lexical sense, 'nearest to the navel', is in use here – and as a pun. On the one hand, *nā́bhi-* 'navel' is often used for the physical focal point of the sacrifice, namely Agni (as in VI.7.4 *nā́bhiṃ yajñā́nām*). When the patron is described / describes himself as *nā́bhānédiṣṭha-* he is accorded or claiming the preeminent position on the ritual ground, beside the ritual fire. On the other, as disc. in the publ. intro., *nā́bhi-* "is a standard metaphor for origin and close kinship (especially the point of origin of two disparate groups)." This same patron is credited in 17a with two lineages (*dvibándhu-*), presumably both divine and human, and "nearest to the navel" would situate him high up the family tree of both, close to the point of bifurcation.

It is the latter sense of *nā́bhānediṣṭha-* that prompts the patron's speech in cd, which again I interpr. quite differently from others. Ge thinks the *sā́* opening the hemistich refers to Agni; it would be feminine by attraction to fem. *nā́bhi-*. (This exact attraction is, admittedly, found in X.10.4 [see comm. ad loc.].) I take pāda c as a disjunctive question (again unlike others): the patron is asking, in a bit of shorthand, whether his navel is higher than "his" or vice versa; that is, in my view, whether he is closer to the top of the tree of lineage than someone else. The someone else (*asyá*) is Agni; with this identification I am in agreement with HPS, though not Ge, who thinks it's the *tád* of *tadbandhu-* in pāda a. Note that *asyá* is accented, though pronominal. This may be because its referent is new to the discourse (which might exclude *te* as referring to Agni in pāda a) or because it is initial in the second half of the disjunctive question.

In d the patron provides the (rather flimsy) evidence for his claim to the higher position: he has a defined place ("the so-many-eth") in the line of descent. "That one" is presumably the originator of the line.

To make the tr. more intelligible, I would now change the first hemistich to "Setting your [=poet's] insight in heaven, the patron whose lineage this is, the one "nearest to the navel," murmurs as he quests."

X.61.19: In this vs., responsive to 18, Agni is the speaker (here I am happily in agreement with most interpr.), and he decisively refutes the patron's boasts. Interestingly he does so by claiming both senses of *nā́bhā-* in *nā́bhānediṣṭha-* (see above). On the one hand, in the first pāda he

emphatically gestures towards the *nā̃bhi-* on the ritual ground: "here is my navel, here is my seat" – namely the fireplace where Agni is situated during the sacrifice. But in the rest of the vs. he claims both the first birth (*prathamajā̃(ḥ)*), putting him higher than his interlocutor, and also double birth (*dvijā̃(ḥ)*), responding to the other's claim of two lineages (*dvibándhu-* 17a). And of course Agni is both a god and thus divine by nature and kindled by men, thus, by the mechanism of his creation, part of the mortal lineage. For the former, note "these gods here are mine" (*imé me devā̃ḥ*), which, as Ge points out (n. 19d), picks up 14a referring to Agni: *yásya devā̃ḥ* "to whom the gods belong."

We must assume that Agni is proclaiming all of this in the here-and-now, on the ritual ground: the annunciatory initial near-deictics are insistent: #*iyám ... ihá ...*, *imé ... ayám ... / ...*, *idám ...*

The referent of *idám*, the milk of the cow as she was being born, isn't clear. Ge tr. "dieses All"; Klein (DGRV II.118) "creation" (supplying *bhúvanam*). Similarly to Klein, I tentatively supply "world" (rather than the "earth" of the publ. tr.). I now think it probably refers both to the world and all its trappings, and also to the ritual ground right here – which, in some sense, are the same: the ritual ground as the microcosmic representation of the universe. Who the cow is, in this instance, I won't venture to speculate – there have been (and will be) more than enough cows in this hymn.

X.61.20–24: The spat between the sacrificial patron and Agni having been decisively settled in Agni's favor, we now turn to the Dawn sacrifice in the five following vss. (20–24). Each begins with *ádha* and each (loosely) treats a different divine figure or figures at the sacrifice (though the patron is not absent), starting and ending with Agni (20, 24). The sacrifice in these vss. is properly conducted, in contrast to the difficulties that beset other sacrifices alluded to in the hymn.

X.61.20: I tr. *aratí-* 'spoked wheel', rather than the 'chariot' favored by Th (Unters. 35) for this passage, because Agni's circular appearance seems always a prominent feature when he is called *aratí-* elsewhere. However, since the *aratí-* is described both as 'unhitching' (*áva syati*) and 'having a double track' (*dvivartaníḥ*), it's an example of pars pro toto – wheel for chariot. The 'unhitching' presumably refers to placing the ritual fire in the hearth, in particular to conveying the fire taken out from the Gārhapatya to the Āhavanīya and settling it there. As Th already suggested (see also Scar [609 n. 873]), the "double track" refers to the course that leads to the gods in heaven and back again.

For *āsu* the publ. tr. supplies 'clans', flg. Old (flg. Ludwig) and Ge. (adopted by Scar). This interpr. can be justified with ref. to 15d *vikṣú yájyū* "the two that seek sacrifice among the clans." However, I am now not certain that it is correct; it could alternatively refer to the cows that are a constant presence in this hymn and will be the focus of the next vs.

Re appositely adduces VI.12.3 *aratír vanerā̃ṭ* "the spoked wheel (of the sacrifice), the ruler in the wood" as parallel to our *aratíḥ ... vaneṣā̃ṭ* -- with rhyming root noun finals, though the underlying roots, √*rāj* and √*sah*, are quite differently shaped.

Re suggests that the nonce phrase *śíśur dán* 'child of the house' is based on the formula *pátir dán* 'lord of the house' (5x, mostly at pāda end). The child is of course Agni, just after kindling, and pāda d depicts his mother (one of the kindling sticks, presumably) giving birth to him, "grown strong with kindness" or, after the comm. ad V.87.4, "with kind attention," probably of the maternal variety.

X.61.21: In my view this vs. concerns the distribution of the Dakṣiṇās at the Dawn sacrifice. The Dakṣiṇā, esp. the lack of one, has been a regular preoccupation of the hymn; see vss. 8 and 10 and my interpr. of 17. But here, in this well-ordered sacrifice, they are properly distributed. The "cows of the maiden" – with Ge I take *kanā́yā(ḥ)* with *gā́va(ḥ)*, not with *úpamātim* as Old does – can also refer to the light of dawn, as so often, but I think the Gift-cows are the primary referents. Contra Klein (DGRV II.118) I do not think the cows refer to the flames of Agni.

On *úpamāti-* see comm. ad VIII.40.9. The "someone swollen (with wealth)" (*śvāntásya kásya cit*) is, in my view, the patron, who is (/may be) then addressed directly in the 2nd hemistich.

It is not entirely clear who the 2nd ps. addressee in c is. Ge seems to favor Agni, and this is possible. Re points out that *sudraviṇaḥ* is addressed to Agni in I.94.15. However, *drávi̯ṇa-* figured earlier in the hymn, in vs. 12. Like our vs. that vs. describes the departure of Dawn's cows, and in that vs. (at least by my interpr.) Indra has control over them, as "moveable property" (*drávi̯ṇam*), which – crucially – he distributes to the bards. Thus Indra serves in that vs. as the model of a patron bestowing Dakṣiṇās, and here I think the voc. *sudraviṇaḥ* is addressed to the human patron at this sacrifice, distributor of Dakṣiṇās, who has been the subject of the middle part of the hymn. The connection between them is, again in my opinion, signaled by the pāda-final *s*-aor. injunctive *yāṭ*, in imperatival function, which picks up the agent noun *yáṣṭā* at the end of 17a. Both of these are unusual forms: *yáṣṭar-* is found only twice in the RV, while injunc. *yāṭ* is found only here in all of Skt. (though the augmented *ayāṭ* is somewhat more common). As Narten points out (Sig-aor. 200), it substitutes here for the very common *si*-impv. *yákṣi*; it therefore seems to have been chosen to send a particular message, which, I think, is the connection with the agent noun *yáṣṭā* in vs. 17, tied together by their superficially deviant phonology.

With Ge (and tentatively Old), I take *vāvṛdhe* as 1st ps., with the poet as subject. This is as close to a dānastuti as he is willing to come.

The name Āśvaghna, lit. 'son/descendent of a horse-slayer', is found only here and is a curious piece of nomenclature. It may refer to the performance of an Aśvamedha by an illustrious ancestor of the current patron. I also wonder if it's not a sly pun on the gambling term **śvaghna-* 'dog-killing (throw)', found in *śvaghnín-*, a term for a successful gambler. Is the poet subtly implying that his patron owes his wealth to risky speculation?

X.61.22: Both Indra, as the model of a patron, and the patrons themselves return here.

The accent on *viddhí* is unexpected. Old suggests that it might be for emphasis; Ge supplies the impv. "(komm)" before it, presumably to allow *viddhí* to open a new clause. My tr., with a dash after "Indra," is meant to suggest that *ádha tvám indra* "And now you, Indra" strongly signals a referent shift and can be taken as its own quasi-clause.

I would now render *viddhí* by "come to know, take note," rather than the misleading stative "know." The point is that we will come into Indra's ken, so he will be prompted to give us wealth.

On the phrase *mahó rāyé* see comm. ad IV.31.11. The tr. here should be modified to "greatly for wealth."

The adj. *anehásaḥ* in d is morphologically ambiguous: it can be an acc. pl. modifying the patrons in pāda c (so Gr) or a gen. sg. modifying *te*. Although the pāda boundary separates it from the patrons and, in fact, c is a repeated pāda (=I.54.11c), I favor the acc. pl. On *anehás-* see

comm. ad vs. 12 above, where I argue that the word refers to the absence of a material lack rather than a moral one. Here I think the point is that the patrons want for nothing and therefore can afford to be especially generous to us. I would therefore alter the tr. to "our patrons who lack nothing ..." If the gen. sg. reading is preferred, it could indicate that Indra, the model patron, lacks nothing. In fact, both readings may be simultaneously meant.

X.61.23: Note that pāda-final *gáviṣṭau* picks up *abhíṣtau* in the previous pāda (22d) and anticipates *puṣṭaú* and *sātaú* in 24 (a and d), all also pāda-final.

The referents in this vs. are quite unclear. Let us begin with dual voc. *rājānā*. There are two (or possibly three) candidates. Ge seems to think that it refers to earthly kings, but this seems quite unlikely, since *rā́jan-* is not used very often for mortal rulers. The two divine pairs in contention are Mitra and Varuṇa (so Sāy.) or the Aśvins (so Re, tentatively). Old vacillates between Mitra and Varuṇa and earthly kings. Both M+V and the Aśvins have already appeared in the hymn – the former in vs. 17, the latter in vs. 4 – and there are arguments in favor of each. The strongest support for M+V is that dual forms of *rā́jan-* almost invariably refer to them, with the exception (in my view) of X.39.11 (see comm. there). On the other hand, the Aśvins fit better in a Dawn sacrifice context than M+V do. Moreover, the rare adj. *saraṇyú-* 'hastening' reminds us that the fem. of this stem, *saraṇyū́-*, is identified as the female who bore (/carried) the Aśvins in the very obscure passage in X.17.2. The use of the adj. here might be meant to conjure up this association. In the end I find it difficult to decide, likewise in vs. 25, but am tolerably sure that a divine, not human, pair is at issue.

Then there is the question of the subject of *sárat* in b, modified by the adj. pair *saraṇyúḥ ... jaraṇyúḥ*, the identity of the dearest vipra (*vípraḥ préṣṭhaḥ*) in c, and whether the referents in b and c are the same. My tentative answer is that the referents are the same and point to Agni, although this is by no means certain. In favor of this identification is the fact that in the following vs. (24cd) the same referent is characterized both as *saraṇyú-* and as a *vípra-*.

The pāda-initial *sárat* echoes the same form at the beginning of 8c, whose subject is Dawn. It is tempting to invoke her here as well, but the clear masc. adjectives (esp. since fem. *saraṇyū́-* is attested elsewhere) make that difficult. Another possibility is that the subj. of *sárat* is Soma, who is elsewhere sometimes the subj. of that verb (e.g., IX.62.16), in which case I would say that the subject switches to Agni in c — though given the evidence adduced above from vs. 24, I consider this significantly less likely. The identification is made all the more difficult because pāda b provides no clear cues. The adj. *saraṇyú-* essentially doubles the verb; the hapax *jaraṇyú-*, obviously modeled on *saraṇyú-*, could equally well belong to 'age', 'sing', or 'awaken'. I have opted for the last (so also Ge, Old tentatively, JSK DGRV II.118) because of my belief that the hymn is really about the Dawn sacrifice, but 'sing' is represented by Sāy., Gr, and Re, inter alia, and a case could be made also for 'age'.

There is a tendency to interpr. dat. *kāráve* as goal with *sárat* (e.g., Ge "zum Sänger eilt"), but datives should not be straight goals of motion. I think rather that *kāráve* ultimately is the beneficiary of the actions in cd – Agni's aid and protection for the bard's patrons, which will ultimately benefit the bard himself.

Agni as *vípra-* is well attested elsewhere.

X.61.24: This is the last of the *ádhā* verses. Several items of vocabulary get recycled here – *saraṇyú-* (c), *vípra-* (d) – but the vs. is confusingly structured.

No doubt the boldest part of my interpr. has to do with pāda b. In this pāda we singers

explicitly "beg" (*īmahe*) for something, but the rest of the vs. is not phrased as a request (though so tr., e.g., by Ge, JSK DGRV II.118). There are no modals; the only finite verb is the indicative *asi*. It is therefore hard to see cd as directly continuing b. I suggest that the request in b is postponed until the final vs. (27), with the intervening material establishing the right to have these requests fulfilled (though quite obscurely). Note that the end of our b pāda, *tád ū nú*, is matched by the beginning of 27, *tá ū ṣú*, which picks up 24b and provides the link to the actual request. Vs. 27 also contains the (likely) modal *bhūta* and so is phrased as a request.

As for the structure of the rest (removing b from consideration), I think it is framed by two locatival phrases, joined by *ca*: *... asya jényasya puṣṭaú* (a) *... śrávasaś ca sātaú* (d). In between the addressee is characterized, perhaps parenthetially, by two phrases, also conjoined by *ca*: *saraṇyúr asya sūnúr áśvo, vípraś cāsi*. (Note that this *ca* precedes the one that conjoins the locatives of a and d and that the two *ca*'s do not interact by my interp. [but see JSK DGRV II.116 for a contrary opinion].) The locative phrases, particularly the first, establish the setting of the request in b as the ritual. I take *asya jényasya* ("of him who is well-born") to refer to Agni: *jénya-* is several times used of Agni (e.g., I.71.4) (on *jénya-* in general, see comm. ad I.128.7). His "thriving" (*puṣṭaú*) is the successful kindling of the ritual fire. As for the other loc., "at the winning of fame," I think this may refer to the poet's role in the production and conferral of fame on the gods, the patron, and himself.

This leaves c and the first half of d, "you, his son, are a hastening horse and an inspired poet," which I take as essentially parenthetical. What is the referent of "his" and what of "you" (implicit in *asi*)? I suggest (though tentatively) that "his" refers to Agni, also found in *asya jényasya* in pāda a, and the referent of "you" is the poet himself – with the poet addressing himself in the 2nd ps. The strongest evidence for this comes from the immed. preceding vs., 23, where, by my interpr. anyway, "the hastening one" (*saraṇyú-*) and the inspired poet (*vípra-*) both refer to Agni. Here we have the same two words, predicated of an unidentified 2nd sg. addressee, who is also identified as "his son" – and therefore presumably shares Agni's characteristics. This identification of Agni and the poet is the necessary preliminary to the next two vss., in which I believe that the unidentified subject is *both* Agni *and* the poet. I realize that this interpr. is quite a stretch, for it assumes that the poet is both participating in the plural "we" of the request in b and addressing himself in the 2nd sg. Such things are not impossible in RVic discourse (see my "Poetic Self Reference," Fs. Skjærvø 2005) but in a hymn this obscure it adds significant complications that can't be established with certainty.

X.61.25–26: As indicated in the publ. intro. as well as just above, I think that the unidentified subject of these vss. is Agni=poet, and the poet is establishing his noble lineage and right to the favor of the gods. The syntax of these vss. is clotted and almost impossible to follow: 25 and 26a and part of 26b form a single sentence, with the main clause in 26, which is preceded by the various dependent clauses in 25, seeming almost to constitute a series of false starts.

X.61.25: As was just noted, the syntax of this vs. is an intricate puzzle – or, to be more straightforward, a mess. I take the whole as an "if" clause, introduced by *yádi* in pāda a, which has two parallel verbs, *jujuṣé* in b and *dā́śat* in d. Interrupting this "if" clause are two interrelated dative phrases in ab (*yuvóḥ ... sakhyā́ya* and *asmé śárdhāya*) and a parenthetical / embedded rel. clause (c and 1st half of d) introduced by *yásmin*, which refers to the subject of the verbs in the "if" clause. There are multiple ways to interpret the vs. (see esp. Old's disc.), which deviate markedly from mine in the overall construal, in the identification of the referents, in the analysis

of the morphology, not to mention the purport of it all. I will not attempt to treat them, but concentrate on my own. I think the point of the vs. is that if Agni=poet is doing his ritual job for the sake of communion with the gods (pāda a) and the exchange of praise and material goods (d), then (in vs. 26) he is praised and seen to be "of good lineage," and he properly conducts the ritual.

The reference of dual *yuvóḥ* is much disputed. I think it must be the same two as the *rājānā* in 23 (q.v.), namely the Aśvins or Mitra and Varuṇa. See the standard treatments for other suggestions. In any case I think they are stand-ins for the gods in general, with whom we wish to establish communion by the sacrifice. As for "us, the troop" (*asmé śárdhāya*), I assume these are the same "we" who made the request in 24b, namely the group of poets and ritual performers. I should note, though not pursue, that most interpr. take *asmé* and *śárdhāya* independently, with the latter referring to the troop of Maruts.

jujuṣé: contra Ge, but with Sāy., Gr, Old, and Re, I take this as a 3rd sg., not 1st sg. With Agni as subj., this means that he likes the praise given him; with the poet as subj., that he feels he has produced a good hymn.

The rel. cl. of c expands on the notion of the praise-hymn conferred or produced in b: in fact, it's not a single praise-hymn, but hymns found in all places that converge on him. That is, Agni receives praises from all over; the poet is a hub of poetic inspiration. The point of the relative clause is clarified by the simile found at the beginning of d: the hymns reach their destination along many different routes.

The easiest part of the vs. is the simple second VP *dā́śat sūnṛ́tāya* at the end. I take *dā́śat* as a 3rd sg. injunc., which is accented because it still belongs to the "if" clause (and also because it begins a new clausette within that clause) – though others consider it a participle.

X.61.26: Here the good ritual work performed by the subject in vs. 25 is rewarded: he is "sung by the waters" and has the gods on his side. Moreover he is "of good lineage" – the *íti* seems intended to mark *subándhuḥ* as a title bestowed on him. This is the lineage that his patron was aiming at and failed to achieve in vss. 17–19; note the term *-bandhu-* in 17–18.

I do not understand why he is hymned/sung by the waters (*gṛṇānó adbhíḥ*). It is true that waters are often considered to be noisy, but I assume there is a further ritual reference here.

With Old and Ge, I take the instr. phrase *námasā suktaíḥ* in b with the clause in pāda c, parallel to *ukthaír vácobhiḥ*.

With Old and Re (but contra Ge), I supply an obj. for *várdhat*. As Re points out, this would otherwise be the only intrans./reflex. form of the well-attested act. stem *várdhati*.

The brief clause at the end of c, *ā́ hí nūnám*, lit. "for now here," lacks both nominal and verbal forms. I think it refers to the accomplishment of the ritual. I supply "he has" and take *ā́* as standing for "arrived." This interpr. follows Ge's, and it could refer to Agni/the poet. Or simply be the equivalent of "voilà." In fact, given that the next vs. refers to the departing gods, the latter seems more likely – indicating that the ritual has been achieved – is at a successful end.

That clause is further amplified by d, which in my opinion simply means that the ritual, the ceremonial "course" (*ádhvan-* for *adhvará-*) that the hymn has traversed, starts from the Dawn, from the "milk," that is, the milky light at dawn, which is nicely contrasted with the ruddy color of Dawn herself. (See the same phrase *páya usríyāyāḥ* in vs. 11.)

X.61.27: With the end of the ritual proper (and the end of the tortured verbal path that led us there), the poet can now express his request with relative simplicity. (See 27b for the initiation of

the request.)

The distracted phrase *maháḥ ... ūtáye* should not have been rendered "for great help," but, like *mahó rāyé* in 22, "greatly for help."

X.62 All Gods

On the structure of this hymn and my disagreements with previous treatments, esp. Ge's, see the publ. intro. For a complete tr. and disc., see also HPS, B+I 193–99. Its relative simplicity is a considerable relief after X.61. The hymn is metrically quite varied, with six different meters represented in its eleven vss.: the first four are in Jagatī, three others (5, 8, 9) in Anuṣtubh, but the other four meters are found once each (Bṛhatī 6, Satobṛhatī 7, Gāyatrī 10, Triṣṭubh 11).

X.62.1–4: The four Jagatī vss. are also united by a refrain in the d pādas and very parallel constructions in the c pādas.

X.62.1: The Dakṣiṇā was of course a preoccupation of X.61 as well, and the achievement of companionship / fellowship (*sakhyá-*) was the aim in X.61.25. Although the Aṅgirases are of course gods and associates of Indra, in this vs. they seem to be acting as if in the role of mortal sacrificers vis-à-vis Indra, exchanging the sacrifice and the Dakṣiṇā for Indra's fellowship and immortality. For the Aṅgirases' attainment of immortality see also X.92.3.

I do not know why "anointed" (*sámaktāḥ*) is used here. Schmidt (193) suggests that it expresses the marriage-like (eheähnlich) relationship between the Aṅgirases and Indra, based on some comments on *sám √añj* in this vs. by Re , but this seems farfeteched.

The c pādas of 1–4 have the structure X [=ABSTRACT NOUN] *aṅgiraso vo astu* "Let there be X for you, o A's." Our c begins with the dat. prn. *tébhyaḥ*, which ordinarily has 3rd ps. ref. Here, however, I think it doubles the *vaḥ* later in the pāda and therefore has 2nd ps. ref. – like the common nom. phrase *sá tvám* (see my 1992 "*sa* figé"). I suggest that it's used here to anchor the case value of dative for the multivalent enclitic *vaḥ*. Once the structure of this pāda was established in that way, the subsequent c pādas needed no such help.

Since Ge believes that the speaker is the Mānava named in the refrain, he supplies "me" as the primary obj. of *práti gṛbhṇīta* (so also HPS), but since I think Mānava is related to the poet's patron (see publ. intro. and vss. 8 and 11), I do not follow him. I think rather that the poet is commending his patron to the Aṅgirases.

X.62.2: The signature deed of the Aṅgirases: the splitting of the Vala cave and release of the cows. The signature verb of the release is often *úd √aj* 'drive up', as here.

Properly speaking, *dīrghāyutvám* is an abstract meaning literally "long-life-ness," but no non-awkward English equivalent comes to mind.

X.62.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this set of deeds is more appropriate to Indra than the Aṅgirases.

As in 2c, we have a nominal abstract that does not go easily into English: good-offspring-ness. The form *suprajāstvá-* is somewhat oddly formed; assuming it's based on (*su)prajā̆-*, the *-s* before the abstract suffix is intrusive and seems to be based on a case form, probably nom. sg. *-prajā̆s*, though opinions differ. See Scar (143), who doesn't pronounce on it but gives clashing reff. to AiG. It is notable that the *s* makes an already over-heavy syllable **ā_tv-* even heavier.

X.62.4: The first three vss. of this quartet (vss. 1–4) have the same structure in the first hemistich: a relative clause introduced by *yé* treating the past deeds of the Aṅgirases. In vs. 1 this rel. cl. has 2nd ps. ref. (2nd pl. pf. *ānaśá*) matching the 2nd pl. in cd; in the other two the 3rd ps. of the rel. cl. in ab gives way to 2nd ps. in cd with the same referents. Here in the final vs. the structure and temporal reference of ab change abruptly. The opening *ayám* 'this one here' signals that the time is the here-and-now, as well as switching the referent to the singular: the subject can no longer be the Aṅgirases of long ago.

The interpr. of this vs. has been muddied by the assumption that *nā́bhā* is a short version of the PN Nābhānediṣṭha, the supposed poet of X.61–62; both Ge and HPS (p. 193) tr. "in der Sippe" (in the clan) and suggest it's a word play on the name (and therefore presumably on the lineage). But I think it simply refers to the fireplace on the ritual ground, as it does (in my view) in X.61.19 (q.v.). In this interpr. *ayám* "this one here" refers to the priest/poet, speaking at the sacrificial hearth.

What "in the house" refers to, I'm not certain – it could be a shorthand reference to the ritual ground as Agni's house, of which he is lord (the title *gṛhápati-* almost exclusively refers to Agni in the RV). Or it could be referring to a more intimate sacrifice than most, performed in the family household, a gṛhya ritual avant la lettre, in this period that predates the Gṛhya / Śrauta ritual split.

Because of the voc. accent, *dévaputrāḥ* can be either a bahuvrīhi 'having gods as sons' (<*devá-putra-*) or tatpuruṣa 'sons of the god(s)' (<*deva-putrá-*). Gr assigns it to the former, though allowing the possibility of the latter. Ge and HPS take it as the latter, "Göttersöhne." In the publ. tr. I opted for the bahuvrīhi because it is securely attested in the RV and elsewhere in Vedic, whereas the tatpuruṣa is not found in Vedic at all (unless here), as far as I can tell. However, I now feel I was wrong, on grounds of sense. The Aṅgirases are not known as the fathers of other divinities, but are several times called "sons of heaven": *divás putrā́saḥ* (III.53.7=nearby X.67.2, IV.2.15). Since the tatpuruṣa would have been simple to create (see *rājaputrá-*, e.g.), I would now change the tr. to "sons of the god(s)." Note that the next vs. (5) presents them as sons of Agni, the (sg.) Aṅgiras, and that vs. 6 gives both Agni and Heaven as progenitors.

X.62.5–6: These two vss. form a pair, mostly repeating the same information or variation thereon and amplifying 4b. It is not clear to me why this duplication was deemed necessary. It is almost as though the poet was considering two different versions, in different meters, and failed to prune one of them. Although repetition and responsion are characteristic of omphalos hymns, and these two verses are in the approximate center of this hymn, the structure of the hymn and its development, with the first four verses unified by a refrain and the last four constituting a dānastuti, do not fit an omphalos hymn.

X.62.7: The first hemistich repeats the motif of the Aṅgirases, here along with Indra, releasing the Vala cows. Curiously it is not only cows but horses (*vrajáṃ gómantam aśvínam*); the latter are not ordinarily associated with the Vala myth elsewhere, and it is not immediately clear to me why they are found here (but see vs. 8 below). The same pāda is found in X.25.5, not in a Vala context, where Soma is urged to release the animals from their pen. Here I would suggest that the action portrayed provides a transition from the Vala myth to the poet's current desire for recompense, and he wants horses as well as cows. The mixture of myth and the here-and-now is also found in the 2nd hemistich, where a generous gift to "me" (presumably this very poet)

reorients the Aṅgirases's mythic deeds towards the present time. To make this clearer I would now substitute "have made fame" for "made fame." Since the subjects of cd are not identified, they can represent the current patrons configured as Aṅgirases.

The act. part. *dádataḥ* in c is interpr. by all as nom. pl., modifying the subj. of *akrata* in d, and I am certain that that is the correct analysis. However, it could instead be a gen. sg. modifying *me*, which adjoins it. Sense speaks against this analysis, but it must be admitted that word order favors it – or, better, tempts the hearer to make the gen. sg. analysis before the more likely nom. pl. one surfaces.

The first member of the adj. *aṣṭakarṇ́yaḥ* is much discussed; see HPS (194) for lit. The "cut-branded" of the publ. tr. follows the etym. of Kuiper, enlarged by KH, on which see EWA s.v. *AKṢ*.

X.62.8–11: The dānastuti that occupies the last four vss. builds on the model of giving provided by the Aṅgirases in the previous vs.

X.62.8: The intrusive presence of the horses in the Vala cave in 7b finds its explanation here, where the poet praises the imminent gift not only of the thousand (cows) found in 7b and 8c, but also one consisting of a hundred horses (*śatā́śvam*).

The phrase *dānā́ya máṃhate* picks up *maṃhate* from 6d and thus connects the patron Manu's munificence with the Aṅgirases; it also reminds us of *maṃhaneṣṭhā́ḥ* and *dānā́ya* in the vss. 1 and 2 of the previous hymn X.61.

X.62.10: On *smáddiṣṭi-* see comm. ad III.45.5.

X.62.11: "Aligning itself with the sun" of the Dakṣiṇā in c of course refers to the fact that in RVic ritual the Dakṣiṇās were distributed at the Dawn sacrifice.

X.63–64

The next two hymns to the All Gods are attributed to Gaya Plāta and appeal to a variety of gods, with the Ādityas esp. prominent in X.63. Neither hymn presents major challenges.

X.63 All Gods

X.63.1: As Ge points out (n. 1a), the sandhi form *dídhiṣanta* could represent the act. part. nom. pl. *dídhiṣantaḥ* rather than the finite med. 3rd pl. *dídhiṣante*. The desid. stem has both act. and mid. forms. Against the participle suggestion one might object that the act. participle slot is already filled by the *u*-stem (pseudo-)participle *didhiṣú-*, but since that stem is specialized in the sense 'desiring to acquire (a spouse)', there would be room for a non-lexicalized participle stem. Still, I favor the Pp medial *-ante* analysis; among other things it avoids the need to posit a predicated pres. participle (not that I object to them).

Ge supplies the verb "kommen" in b to govern *jánimā*, but I see no reason not to construe that noun with *dídhiṣante* in pāda a. Since the gods have been gratified by Manu (*mánuprītāsaḥ* b) and already in the RV Manu is called Manu Vivasvant and later regularly has the patronymic Vaivasvata (see Macd., Ved. Myth. 139), it makes sense that the gods would wish to help Manu by establishing the races associated with him.

The interest of the 2nd hemistich lies in the mention of Yayāti Nahuṣya, but there is no

evidence in the two bare mentions of him in the RV (also I.31.17) of the dramatic episodes concerning Yayāti Nāhuṣa in the MBh (I.70–80); he is merely a minor ritualist in the RV.

X.63.2: Ge (n. 2cd) follows Sāy. in seeing Aditi here as Heaven, which would make sense of the rest of the trio. However, I don't know of any particular support for this identification; the next vs. is not sufficient (see comm. there).

X.63.3: Re points out the double alliteration in pāda a: *mātā́ mádhumat pínvate páyaḥ*, the latter continued in b by init. *pīyū́ṣam*. The rest of b, *dyaúr áditir ádribarhāḥ*, is also a phonetic figure with the repetitions of *d*-s and *r*-s and the initial *ádi* .. *ádri* echo.

Again Ge (n 3ab) considers this vs. to concern "Himmel-Aditi," with *dyaúḥ* being feminine, as it sometimes is. I find this unnecessary and also detrimental to the complexity of the thought. Aditi is instead *compared* to heaven, in an unmarked simile. The basis of comparison is twofold. On the one hand, as JPB (*Ādityas*, p. 235) points out, Aditi is like heaven in producing liquid nourishment (rain on the part of heaven, milk on hers). On the other, there is a pun on the name *áditi*- lit. 'without bounds'; in this sense heaven is *áditi*- 'unbounded'. JPB (pp. 235–36) rejects this pun, which is favored by Bergaigne and Hillebrandt, but I find the suggested pun persuasive.

The sense and semantic application of the cmpd *ádri-barhas*- are hard to discern, in part because -*barhas*- does not occur independently but only in two cmpds, this one (a hapax) and the considerably better-attested *dvi-bárhas*-. In all instances of the latter the publ. tr. renders the cmpd 'doubly lofty / exalted' in contrast to the standard rendering 'doubly strong' (e.g., Gr "doppelte Festigkeit, Stärke, Grösse habend'. (The publ. tr. of course presupposes a bahuvrīhi 'having double loftiness/height'.) The sense 'height, loftiness' rather than 'strength' for the underlying *s*-stem is supported by the YAves. correspondent *barəzah*- 'height, mountain' and by the existence of the extremely well-attested and inherited non-participial -*nt*-stem *bṛhánt*- 'lofty'. The latter is ordinarily associated with the Caland system (among the many reff., see, e.g., Lowe, *Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit*, pp. 284–85), and, though I am generally slow to invoke the Caland system, *bárhas*- might well be a Caland -*s*-stem. associated with *bṛhánt*-. The contexts of *dvibárhas*- are not diagnostic: either 'doubly strong' or 'doubly lofty/exalted' fits them all without adding much meaning in either case. There are some suggestive collocations, however; see esp. VIII.15.2 *dvibárhaso bṛhát*, VII.8.6 *úd ... janiṣīṣta dvibárhāḥ* (noting the *úd*), and IV.5.3 where *dvibárhas*- follows 2 occurrences of *bṛhánt*- in vs. 1. See also vs. 4 here.

So much for *dvibárhas*-; the form in our passage is actually the other cmpd, the hapax *ádri-barhas*-, likewise a bahuvrīhi. I render it in the publ. tr. by 'massive as a stone', which accords more or less with Gr, Ge 'felsenfest', Re 'à la resistance de rocher', but which attributes a different sense to -*barhas*- than the one we gave to *dvi-bárhas*-. This certainly needs to be rectified, and, assuming the correctness of 'loftiness' in *dvibárhas*-, our cmpd should mean 'having the loftiness of a stone'. What would this really mean, and what would it mean in context? Now *ádri*- refers not only to stone the substance and stone(s) the object(s), but also to mountains or mountain peaks (possible exx. include III.32.16, V.87.2, VI.48.5, etc.), so *ádri-bárhas*- can have the sense 'having the loftiness of a mountain peak'. Here the adj. would apply to heaven, and though it might seem like a comedown (literally) for the height of heaven to be compared to that of an earthly mountain, the visual effect of soaring mountain peaks actually gives a stronger impression of height than simply looking at the sky. I would now emend the tr. to "(like) unbounded heaven, which has the loftiness of a mountain peak." Support for the 'lofty'

rendering of *-barhas-* here comes from the next vs., with *bṛhát* in 4b and a different word referring to the height of heaven in 4d (*divó varṣmā́ṇam*). It might be tempting to consider *ádri-* here as a designation of heaven, reflecting the notion of the stony firmament that is prominent in Avestan texts, but it is a temptation that I think should be resisted. There is almost no real evidence in Vedic for this concept – the passages under Gr's def. 5) s.v. *áśman-* "der *Himmel*, der als steinernes Gewölbe gedacht ist" should all be interpr. otherwise (however, see comm. ad II.12.3, where I interpret the dual *áśmanoḥ* as referring to the two world halves), and in any case we would expect *áśman-*, corresponding to Aves. *asman-* (*/asan-*), in this sense, rather than *ádri-*.

The sense of the cmpd *vṛṣa-bhará-* is unclear. Parallel formations like *vājaṃ-bhará-* 'bringing prizes', *sahasram-bhará-* 'bringing thousands' suggest that *vṛṣa-* should function as object; hence Gr's '"Männer hegend," Ge's "Stierlasten tragenden," Re's "qui portent (des charges de) taureaux," but none of these seems satisfactory, primarily because *vṛṣa* has to be attenuated or manipulated in some way. Moreover, those other cmpds have an overt acc. marker on the first member, whereas this has the stem form. I take *vṛṣa-* as a pseudo-adverbial 'bullishly'. Note also that the compound seems to invite an alternative segmentation *vṛ̥ṣabha(-rá)-* with a different word for bull, *vṛṣabhá-*, though this does not yield sense. The 2nd member *-bhara-* also scrambles *-barhaḥ-* in the preceding pāda.

Pāda d contains a poetic self-address (so also Ge n. 3d).

X.63.4: For the relevance of *bṛhát* and *varṣmā́ṇam* to the previous vs., see comm. there.

X.63.6: Unaccented *manuṣaḥ* must be a part of the vocative phrase beginning *víśve devāsaḥ*, but its role is disputed. Gr and Old take it as a voc. pl., presumably (neither translates) parallel to *devāsaḥ* – hence "o all gods (and) men." Ge takes it as gen. sg. dependent on *víśve devāsaḥ*, and I follow him; the lack of accent on the gen. is regular in tightly constructed voc. phrases of the type *sūno* [voc.] *sahasaḥ* [gen.] "o son of strength." Ge points out (n. 6b) that taking it as a voc. would require it to refer to the interrog. *káḥ* in pāda a, while *víśve devāsaḥ* would double the subj. of 2nd pl. *jújoṣatha*, a complex distribution of vocc., which would also match a sg. *káḥ* to pl. *manuṣaḥ.* Re also takes it as gen. sg., but supplies additional material: "o tous dieux (et) (fils) de l'Homme," which seems to combine the drawbacks of both interpr. with no particular benefit. The presence of sg. *mánuḥ* in the. next vs. favors Ge's (and my) interpr.: since Manu was the first to establish sacrifice for the gods, they can legitimately be termed "the gods of Manu." Manu is perhaps the (or an) implicit answer to the questions introduced by *káḥ* in pādas a and c, even though those questions refer to the present (*rādhati*) and future (subj. *karat*).

X.63.7: On the morphological and metrical problems of *āyejé* see comm. ad I.114.2. There is also a conceptual one, at least in the standard interpr. Both Ge and Re take *hótrām* as a common noun (Ge "das Opfer," Re "la ... oblation"; Gr "Opferguss"), but the lexeme *ā́ √yaj* means 'attract/win by sacrifice', not simply 'offer/sacrifice [a substance]' (see comm. ad IX.7.8). In this particular case the obj. *hótrām* is, in my interpr., not merely the libation, but the deified Libation, who is clearly present in the next hymn, also by Gaya, in X.64.15. The point here, as I see it, is that Manu attracted the goddess Libation to his sacrifice by his initial sacrificial performance, and she then contributed a significant element to the subsequent sacrifice, namely the libation. For a similar ambiguity between ritual element and goddess with this verbal lexeme, see I.40.4 *íḷām ... ā́ yajāmahe* and comm. ad loc. Note that the goddesses Hotrā and Iḍā 'Refreshment' are

found together in the Āprī hymn I.142.9; cf. also II.1.11.

This interpr. has implications for the interpr. of the rest of the hemistich: in b *mánasā* could be construed either with *sámiddhāgniḥ* or with *saptá hótṛbhiḥ*. Ge opts for the latter, Re for the former ("ayant allumé le feu avec réflexion"); I think Re is correct. If Manu initially lacked one of the crucial elements of sacrifice, namely libation/Libation, he had to institute the sacrifice, kindle the fire, mentally, before the physical element was attracted to the sacrifice by Manu's purely mental observance.

X.63.8: This vs. modulates from 3rd ps. in the rel. cl. (*īśire*, pāda a) to 2nd ps. in the main cl. (*pipṛtā* d); the modulation pivots on *té*, which opens the 2nd hemistich: *té* can of course be the 3rd ps. correlative to *yé* opening the rel. cl., but it can also have 2nd ps. ref. with the impv. in d. (See my "*sa* figé.") The ambiguity of pāda c cannot be conveyed in tr.; it is only in pāda d that the voc. *devāsaḥ* and the 2nd pl. impv. *pipṛtā* unambiguously signal the change in person.

X.63.10: The long accusative phrase in abc of this vs. at first appears to be a continuation of the accs. in 9cd, which are objects of *havāmahe* in 9a. The surfacing of a well-oared boat in 10a calls this initial interpr. into question, since we would be unlikely to invoke a boat, and in d we come upon a new verb, *ā́ ruhema* 'may we mount', which reconfigures the audience's interpr. of the verse. Or such is my interpr. – Ge takes ab with vs. 9 and starts a new sentence with 10c. (Re's punctuation is unclear and a bit incoherent.) Ge's interpr. is of course possible and is in some way easier, but since we try to preserve the integrity of verses when possible and since this poet shows some interest in syntactically misleading the audience (see vss. 8 and later 13–14, both with comm.), I prefer to take 10 as a unit. See further comm. ad vs. 14.

Note that pādas a and b begin with morphologically identical and rhyming *sutrā́māṇam* ..., *suśármāṇam*. Pādas a and c also end that way: ... *anehásam*# / ... *ánāgasam*, with acc. sg. masc. negated *s*-stems -- a small piece of evidence that the verse should be taken as a unit.

X.63.11: As Re points out, *ádhi vocata* reprises *ádhi bruvantu* in 1d, though with relexicalization. But this echo does not seem to signal a ring or other structual feature, and the tendency for this hymn to keep circling around the same topics makes the thematic repetition fairly unremarkable.

X.63.12: Almost predicatably, Re interprets the first hemistich in a Dumézilian (though his name is not mentioned) trifunctional fashion: disease, absence of oblation, hostility (Functions 3, 1, 2, I assume). I do not see that such a formal structure is needed to appreciate the variety of threats envisioned, but it is certainly one of the more convincing invocations of Dumézil in the RV.

X.63.13: As transmitted, pāda a is a syllable short and would have a rare break of three heavy syllables (*márto víśv[a]*). Arnold (*Metre*, metrical comm. ad loc. and p. 101) suggests reading **márt^{i}yo* for transmitted *márto*, a change endorsed by Old and reflected in the HvN edition. Bloomfield (VV ad I.41.2) rejects this emendation on what seem insufficient grounds, but he does draw attention to the fact that our imperfect pāda *áriṣṭaḥ sá márto víśva edhate* seems based on *áriṣṭaḥ sárva edhate* in I.41.2=VIII.27.16 (in the latter case directly following our pāda b). Although I would not accept Bloomfield's rather mechanical attempt to generate our pāda from the shorter one (*áriṣṭaḥ sá [márto viś]va edhate*, with *sá ... va* the disjecta membra of *sárvaḥ*), it does seem as if some effort was made to replace *sárva-* with *víśva-* -- oddly, since *víśva-* is

somewhat in retreat in Maṇḍala X, in favor of *sárva-*. But this is a Viśve Devāḥ hymn and forms of *víśva-* are prominent in it (vss. 2a, 6b, 8b, 11a, 13d, 17b). See also Ge's (n. 13a) and Re's brief comm. on *víśva-* and *sárva-* in this passage.

Pāda b is also found at VI.70.3 and VIIII.27.16; as was just discussed, the latter also has a variant of our pāda a.

X.63.14: The structure of this vs. is very close to that of vs. 10, in that the first hemistich focuses on accusative referents (*yám ... yám*), which seem to continue the acc. reference of 13cd (*yám*), but which in the end can be construed with the acc. phrase in pāda c, headed by *rátham*, which is the obj. of *ā́ ruhema* in d. This redirection of the accusatives in ab from connection with the end of the previous vs. to what follows in their own vs., the focus on a material means of transportation (*nā́vam* in 10c, *rátham* in 14c), and the presence of the same verb governing it in d (*ā́ ruhema*) in pādas of identical structure (negated acc. sg. pres. part. [*ásravantīm* / *áriṣyantam*] *ā́ruhema s^{u}vastaye* – all this imposes my interpr. of vs. 10, against Ge's. The cleverness of this verse is that, because in the previous verse (13) the referent of *yám* (13c) was a mortal (13a *sá mártaḥ*), the assumption is that the two *yám*-s in 14ab continue this reference -- until in pāda c it is revealed to be a chariot (*rátham*), which is in fact just as appropriate in the two relative clauses of ab as a mortal would be. Another example of deliberate misdirection.

X.63.15: The rendering of *vṛjáṇa-* as 'precinct' rather nicely taps into their shared etymological semantics, from 'enclosure', then to area or district, inter alia. For more on *vṛjáṇa-* see comm. ad X.27.2. I do not subscribe to Ge's understanding of *vṛjáṇa-* as "Kampf"; better Re's tr. of the phrase "dans le district pourvu de lumière solaire."

On pl. *yóniṣu* see comm. ad X.40.11.

X.63.17: It is possible, but not necessary, to supply *devāḥ* with voc. *víśve* and take *ādityāḥ* as a separate term—"o All (Gods), Ādityas, (and) Aditi"— to signal in this last vs. that the hymn is in fact dedicated to the All Gods

The name, or nom de plume, of the poet Amartya Gaya recalls Aves. *gaiia- marətan-*, the (name of the) first man, and in my view is a pun based on a reminiscence of this Indo-Iranian figure. For a similar, but slightly different view, see KH "Mārtāṇḍa and Gayōmart," MSS 1957 = Aufs. 422–38, esp. 435. See also Ge's n. 4.

Ge takes *īśānā́so náraḥ ... jáno divyáḥ* as an (unsignaled) conjoined NP: "Die mächtigen Herren und das himmlische Volke," both subjects of sg. *ástāvi*. Sāy., at least, considers the former to refer to rich human men; Ge does not make his view about the referent known. Although a singular verb for this conjoined NP could perhaps be justified by having it agree with the nearer member, sg. *jánaḥ*. I think it more likely that sg. *jáno divyáḥ* is an appositive to the preceding pl., which would make the sg. verb easier to account for. So, it seems, Re: "Les seigneurs puissants, la gent céleste."

X.64 All Gods

X.64.1: Note the etymological figure *sumántu (nā́ma) ... manāmahe*; *sumántu-* here does not seem to have anything to do with *mántavaḥ* 'counselors' in the previous hymn, X.63.8. With the *sumántu nā́ma* here compare Yama's *durmántu ... nā́ma* in X.12.6, where it is contrasted with one that is *sumántu*; see comm. ad loc.

Ge takes *yā́mani* to well-attested *yā́man-* 'journey' and construes it with the gen. pl. part. *śṛ́ṇvatā́m* in b ("die auf der Fahrt erhören"); this is certainly possible. He cites several supposed parallels, esp. X.92.13 *yā́mani śrutam* "hear this on your journey" (addressed to the Aśvins). However, though the Aśvins are famous for their travel, the assumption of a journey for the unnamed group of gods, in the first vs. of the hymn, is perhaps less appealing. The publ. tr. "as they listen to my plea" follows Re's "qui (nous) entendent dans (notre) imploration," with *yā́man-* to √*yā* 'beg, implore'. Other passages containing *yā́man-* 'plea' (may) include I.25.20 (also with √*śru* ; Ge 'Fahrt'), VIII.52.5 (Vāl.) *áyāman* (again generally interpr. as 'journey'), as well as the cmpd *yā́ma-hūti-* (X.117.3). It may of course also be a pun, also in passages like X.92.13. For a semantically similar phrase in this hymn see 4d *śṛ́ṇotu ... hávīmani* "let him harken to my call."

X.64.2: Note the matching etymological figures opening pādas a and b: *kratūyánti krátavaḥ ...*, *vénanti venā́ḥ*, also with matching syntax (3rd pl. act. pres. + nom pl. masc. subj.). The denom. *kratūyá-* is found only here and in IV.24.4, while the pres. *véna-* is better attested. On *vená-* and its relatives, see esp. comm. ad VIII.100.5, as well as Re's comm. to this vs. (ÉVP IV.118).

Old seems somewhat inclined to read *ādíśaḥ* here (as also at I.119.2), against the transmitted *ā́ díśaḥ*, which would yield a tr. "(Our) aims are flying," vel sim., which would yield reasonable sense. Evidence in favor of this reading might be found in IX.21.5 *dádhātā venám ādíśe* with similar lexicon. However, the *ādíśe* there is infinitival and the *vená-* refers to soma, so the similarity is far less than it first appears. It is also the case that 7 of the 9 occurrences of *ādíś-* (all of which are trisyllabic) occur at the end of the pāda, as here. Nonetheless, since the transmitted text makes sense, and, as an acc. pl., *díśaḥ* provides a goal for the verb of motion *patáyanti*, I do not favor emendation. In fact given the preponderance of pāda-final *ādíśe*, etc., it would be hard to explain how an original *ādíśaḥ* acquired a second accent, since other occurrences of the root noun cmpd. in the same metrical position would favor maintaining the singly accented form.

For a somewhat similar expression of the poet's senses and sense organs flying apart widely in his inspiration, see VI.9.6.

X.64.3: The *vā* in 2nd position in the vs. is a bit surprising, and several emendations have been proposed: to the particle *vaí* (see Klein DGRV II.206), to *vaḥ* (Old). However, the transmitted text makes fine sense: given the long list of divinity names occupying most of the four pādas of the vs., the poet chose to signal early that it was a *disjunctive* list; otherwise a *vā* would have to have been placed after every (or almost every) term (and there are 12 different entities) or would have to be postponed till the end of the last pāda. Ge's "Soll ich vielleicht ...?" and Re's "Dois je éventuellement ...?" both capture the force of *vā* nicely; Klein also slightly favors this solution, though he worries about the lack of parallel usages.

Note that the loose cmpd. *nárā-śáṃsam* is split by *vā* taking Wackernagel's position.

The referent of *ágohya-* is disputed and unclear. Gr identifies it as Agni; Macdonell (Ved. Myth. 35) suggests it's an epithet of Pūṣan here, but there is no evidence for that elsewhere, and the other passages suggest that the *ágohya-* is an independent figure. Re identifies him with Indra in this passage, but gives no evidence. Ge goes rather for Savitar, which is the default (if there is one); see the parenthetic ident. for most of Gr's entries. JPB (pub. intro. to I.161) suggests the sun, but possibly Savitar, the latter identification being the one he favors in the publ. intro. to IV.33. I do not have my own candidate, but it should be noted that the word appears generally in

association with the Ṛbhus (though not here). See I.110.3, 161.11–13, V.33.7; the only passage besides ours outside of this context is VIII.98.4, where it seems to be used in adjectival sense ("who cannot be concealed") of Indra. The Ṛbhu passages concern their twelve-day sleep (IV.33.7) "in the house of Agohya" (I.161.11). This may refer to the intercalary days needed to bring the lunar calendar into synch with the solar cycle. Given some of the other potential recipients of the praise in this vs. – Sun and Moon, (New and) Full ['bright'] Moon, Dawn and Night, all entities that regulate time – I wonder if Agohya here refers to the divinity who oversees the intercalary period (who could, of course, be Savitar or the Sun).

The hapax lexeme *abhy àrcase* (1x) belongs to the class of *-se* annunciatory 1st singulars in the realm of praising, of which well-attested *stuṣé* is the standard example and presumable source. There also exists an *s*-stem inf. *ṛcáse* to the same root and in the same general meaning, on which see comm. ad VII.61.6.

Ge (n. 3c) suggests that the dual *candrámasā* is a pregnant dual dvandva for "Neu- und Vollmond," though he offers as an alternative a mere pleonastic doubling of *sū́ryāmā́sā*. I find his first alternative quite appealing. Although *candrá-mas-* is attested a number of times in the singular, where it seems simply to refer to the moon, this is the only dual form. The dual could easily refer pregnantly to two forms of the moon (Re's "des deux (formes de) Lune"), full and new, of which the "bright, gleaming" (*candrá-*) full moon would be the more conspicuous of the two and give its name to the duo.

There is some disagreement about the scope of *diví*. Ge (fld by the publ. tr.) takes it with immediately preceding *yamám* ("Yama im Himmel"), but Re with *tritám*, despite the intervening pāda boundary – presumably on the basis of Trita's association with heaven elsewhere (see the passages cited by Ge [n. 3c]: V.9.5, 41.4). To me both these interpr. seem too limited and assume that *diví* can only be construed with one immediately adjoining term. I would suggest that *diví*, which in final position produces a fine Jagatī cadence, is to be construed with all the elements in the pāda or, better, with the two duals referring to heavenly bodies: *sū́ryāmā́sā candrámasā*. Elsewhere *diví* doesn't have to immediately adjoin the entity whose position it specifies. I would now slightly alter the tr. to "or the Sun and Moon, (the new and) bright [=full] Moon in heaven, Yama, Trita ..." Note that the pāda-final loc. *sadhástha ā́* in 8c applies to all the terms in its pāda.

Re points out that this is the only passage where *aktú-* is found with *uṣás-*, and the phrase *uṣásam aktúm* substitutes for the dual dvandva *uṣā́sānáktā*. Given the two dual dvandvas in c, we might expect that dvandva here as well. But that form would produce a very irregular break, as well a bad cadence and hiatus before *aśvínā*. One might have expected as substitute here *uṣásaṃ *náktam*, which would have given a somewhat better break (the standard ⏑ ⏑ –, rather than the transmitted ⏑ ⏑ ⏑, which, acdg. to Arnold, is considerably less common than the former, but still within his parameters). See VIII.27.2 (ad comm. ad loc.) with the hybrid pāda opening *uṣā́sā náktam*, with the 1st member of the dual dvandva followed by the sg. of 'night'. I might almost speculate that a putative original *uṣásaṃ *náktam* in our passage underwent degemination of *-ṃ n-* and the old *náktam* was replaced by phonetically similar *aktúm*, which lacks the nasal initial. But this probably goes too far.

X.64.4: The poet Gaya uses almost the same words to describe himself in vs. 16 that he applies to Bṛhaspati here: 4a *kathā́ kavís tuvīrávān* ... / 16a *evā́ kavís tuvīrávān* ..., ... *gáyaḥ*, thus clearly identifying himself with Bṛhaspati. I wonder if *káyā* in the instr. phrase ending pāda a here, *káyā girā́*, is meant to evoke his name.

The stem *ṕkvan-* 'chanters, versifiers' usually refers to non-humans, several times of a group connected with Bṛhaspati (VII.10.4, X.14.3), so the instr. *ṕkvan-* here expresses accompaniment, not the agency of human poets creating the call.

X.64.5: The *vā* here seems to add further choices of goods to praise and/or pursue to the ones offered in vs. 4. However, the syntactic structure of the vs. is rather loose. The dual dvandva *mitrā́varuṇā* is acc. with *ā́ vivāsasi*, generally replicating the syntax of vs. 3: god(s) ACC *abhy àrcase*. But M+Vs' constant partner Aryaman appears in the 2nd hemistich as nominative, though we might expect him to be a third obj. to *ā́ vivāsasi*. Since there is no finite verb in cd or any obvious predicate, Aryaman simply hangs there, a notional, but not syntactic, object. I do not like the idea, sometimes floated by Ge., of simple reversion to the nominative. Here I think we must interpr. the dual *mitrā́varuṇā*, ambiguous between nom. and acc., as the pivot to the nominative in cd. Re is obviously disturbed by the syntactic rupture and re-supplies *ā́ vivāsasi* and re-establishes the acc. pattern, in a parenthesis that supplies all relevant parts of the sentence and rests on nothing in the text: "(veux-tu le gagner à toi)."

On the first pāda, see the disc. of HPS (*Vrata* p. 74), who strongly asserts Agni as identical to Dakṣa (hesitantly so also Ge, n. 5a); so also tentatively Ge (n. 5a) and JPB (Ādityas, 243), as well as the publ. tr. HPS is himself hesitant about whose *vratá-* it is, but JPB argues persuasively that it is Aditi's, and the publ. tr. follows his view by implication.

Aryaman is called *átūrtapanthāḥ* and *páñcahotā* in V.42.1, *purujātáḥ* in VII.35.2.

X.64.6: As discussed ad VIII.103.3, which contains an almost identical pāda, *tmánā* "by themselves/himself" contrasts the individual effort that goes into the winning with the multiplicity of things won ("thousand(s)"). I do not think, with Ge, that *tmánā* should be construed in the simile with *medhásātau* ("wie bei dem Kampf um die (Dichter)meisterschaft selbst"). Among other things, in VIII.103 the next vs. also contains *tmánā* juxtaposed with a form containing 'thousand' and expressing the same contrast: *tmánā sahasrapoṣíṇam* "who fosters a thousand by himself."

Re takes *medhásātāv iva* as a simile with *samithéṣu* in d – in his clotted tr. "... dans les compétitions, comme (d'autres font) dans les (occasions où l'on obtient un) gain (pour prix) de l'inspiration-poétique." But this requires scooping up the simile from the main clause in c and inserting it in the relative clause in d, which would violate standard RVic syntactic practice.

X.64.7: Note the phonetic figure in d: ... *sácante sacítaḥ sácetasaḥ*, with the last two words also an etymological figure. *sácante* also etymologically echoes *sakhyā́ya* in b.

Ge takes both *sacítaḥ* and *sácetasaḥ* as nom. pl.; on poetic grounds, I prefer Re's interpr., with one gen. sg., referring to Savitar, and the other nom. pl. Either of them would in fact fit either morphological role.

X.64.8: A somewhat maladroit phonetic and etymological figure in d, *rudráṃ rudréṣu rudr^{i}yàm*, which also serves as a particularly heavy final Behaghel's Law member with Kṛśānu and Tiṣya.

X.64.10: Ge and Re both give lexical weight to *bṛhaddivā́*, both rendering it as an apparent bahuvrīhi ("die im hohen Himmel wohnt," "celle du haut du ciel"). But it does not have bahuvrīhi accent (as opposed to *bṛháddiva-*), and it is rather the name of a minor goddess, who appears in company with other such. See II.31.4, where she is found with Iḍā, Rodasī, and

Puraṃdhi, as well as Tvaṣṭar and the wives of the gods as here; V.41.19 with Iḍā and Urvaśī; V.42.12 with Sarasvatī and Rākā.

On *devébhir jánibhiḥ* see comm. ad II.36.5 (also VI.50.13).

On the morphologically problematic *ráthaspátiḥ* and the possibly associated metrical issue (11-syllable Jagatī) see comm. ad V.50.5.

X.64.11: The first pāda is identical to I.144.7d. I take it as a continuation of the previous vs., whose final pāda (X.64.10d) also begins with *raṇváḥ*. Ge and Re by contrast construe it with the following pāda, b. Although we generally aim to interpr. RVic vss. as self-contained units, in this case there is a gender clash between pādas a and b, since the subj. of b is fem. *úpastutiḥ*, which does not match the masc. *raṇváḥ* in a. One could explain the masc. as attraction to the gender of the simile (m. *kṣáyaḥ*) or, with Bl (ad I.144.7), consider its lack of fit simply a sign that it was secondarily inserted here. But I prefer to consider it an afterthought to 10d.

X.64.12: The series of vocatives in ab, *máruta índra dévāḥ ... varuṇa mitra* displays odd accentuation: the first three are accented, though their position internal to the pāda should not trigger accentuation; the two in b are unaccented, though they occupy the same position as those in pāda a, namely after an early caesura.

Two of the three 2nd pl. act. verb forms in this vs., *ádadāta* (b) and *pīpayata* (c), are morphologically irregular. The first is surely an imperfect to the redupl. pres. *dádāti*, but we should expect a weak form in the pl.; cf. the equivalent form *ádattana* (I.139.7). (Trying to make it into a pluperfect would gain us nothing, since, as far as I can see, that form should be identical.) Unexpected full grade in the 2nd pl. act. (of all types of stems) is not altogether unusual, esp. in the imperative: see *dádāta* (VII.57.6) and *dadātana* (X.36.10) beside *datta* (2x); here it might have spread from the impv. to the impf. As for *pīpayata*, probably (but not certainly) belonging to the perfect -- in addition to the full-grade root syllable, there is also the thematic vowel. For a 2nd pl. act. impv. to the perfect, we should probably expect **pīpita* (cf. *pīpihí* 2x); a thematized stem with full-grade root syllable should belong to the subjunctive. A subjunctive interpr. might be favored by the undoubted 2nd pl. pres. act. subjunctive *váhātha* in the next pāda. However, the 2nd pl. act. subj. is supposed only to take the primary ending *-tha*, not *-ta* as here. (Note the undoubted 2nd pl. pf. subj. *bubódhatha* in the next vs., 13b.). Moreover, the pf. to √*pī* includes a number of apparent thematic forms, though most are built to the weak stem (e.g., likewise 2nd pl. impv. *pīpyata* II.34.6, on which see comm. ad loc.). For disc. of these pseudo-thematic forms see my 2018 "The Vedic Perfect Imperative and the Status of Modal Forms to Tense-Aspect Stems" (Fs. Lubotsky). As for the full-grade root in our *pīpayata*, I think it likely that the tendency for 2nd pl. imperatives to take full grade is at work here; however, it is worth considering Kü's compromise (p. 300 n. 495): that these impvs. with full grade are "hybride Bildungen zu einem Konjunktiv *pīpáyat*."

X.64.13: As with 10d and 11a, our pāda a begins like the final pāda of the preceding vs. (12d), with *kuvíd*.

Ge interpr. *yáthā cid* as an indefinite "irgendwie," followed by Re ("en quelque sorte") and the publ. tr. (also Hettrich, *Hypotaxe* 149, though without discussion). Such an interpr. fits the context in my opinion: the poet is looking for any kind of acknowledgement of his kinship with the gods. Old argues strenuously against this interpr., on what seem to me fairly weak grounds; he thinks rather that the *yáthā* signals that there's an intervening syntactic link

("Mittelglied") between the *kuvíd* and the *yáthā*, which keeps its subordinating function: "Ob doch (es geschehen wird) dass ihr diese Verwandtschaft mit uns wahrnehmen werdet." I do not see the advantage of this distancing construction, and his rendering seems to ignore the *cit*.

The navel in pāda c is surely, as Ge persuasively argues (n. 13c), a pun, referring both to the Opferaltar, where mortals and gods meet at the ritual, and to the bodily navel as a symbol of kinship, as so often in the RV.

X.64.14: This vs. seems to play on the gendering possibilities and ambiguities of the dual dvandva *dyā́vāpṛthivī́* that is its subject. In the first hemistich the cmpd not only displays the feminine grammatical gender that is appropriate to a dvandva with fem. 2nd member: so the introductory fem. du. pronominal adj. *té* and the adj. *yajñíye* (b). But it also aggressively ascribes female characteristics to the pair, identifying the two as dual mothers and great goddesses: *mātárā mahī́ devī́*.

The third pāda is less insistently female, though still grammatically feminine (*ubhé*): the two support/carry/bear both (breeds). The redupl. pres. *bibhṛtaḥ* can express simple non-gendered support; however, it's worth noting that it can take a mother, esp. Earth as mother, as subject (e.g., X.4.3 *mātā́ bibharti*; III.55.22 *pṛthivī́ bibharti*) and a child or embryo as object (e.g., III.46.5 *gárbhaṃ ná mātā́ bibhṛtáḥ* with both). Given the dual mothers of the 1st hemistich, a female/motherly interpr. might be the first to come to mind.

The final pāda contrastively asserts the masculinity of the same pair, Heaven and Earth. Here both together "sprinkle much seed/semen" (*purū́ rétāṃsi ... siñcataḥ* -- a decidedly male action and something of a shock after the pervasive motherly focus of the rest of the verse. The participation of the "fathers" (/forefathers/ancestors) is also unexpected and unexplained. I think that they appear here to balance out the "mothers" of the earlier part of the verse and to remind us that Heaven is, outside of this dvandva, both male and the Father par excellence (*dyaúṣ pitā́*). By this interpr. the Pitars are sidekicks to the Ur-Pitar in this male activity. A possible clue to this indirect use of *pitṛ́bhiḥ* for contrastive purposes may be provided by the *ca* that follows it. This conjunction is oddly placed in its pāda and it seems to be doing none of its usual conjoining work. Klein (DGRV I.103) considers it a clausal *ca* but is hard-pressed to explain what it's doing and why it's so positioned. I suggest that it implicitly – and conceptually -- conjoins *pitṛ́bhiḥ* with *mātárā* in pāda a, to add up to a dvandva with both genders represented. Admittedly, this is a speculative explanation, but such aberrant usages invite speculation.

The phrase *devā́ñ jánman-* raises problems in its various appearances – not only here, but I.71.3 and VI.11.3. On the one hand, the existence of a parallel phrase *devā́nāṃ jánman-* (I.70.6, VI.51.2 [though see comm. ad loc.], 12; not adjacent IX.81.2) supports the widespread view (Lanman, Noun Infl. 353–54, Old [for some of the passages], Ge, etc.) that *devā́n* is an archaic (or truncated) gen. pl. On the other, I am generally reluctant to posit such a form, if it is possible to construe the acc. pl. that *devā́n* appears to be. In both I.71.3 and VI.11.3 an acc. interpr. is possible, but it is very difficult in this passage. I therefore must accept the gen. pl. interpr. here, and at least as an alternate in the other two passages. Whether the form represents a deeply archaic gen. pl. **devā́m* < **-o-ōm* I do not venture to say.

ubháya- 'both' is found fairly regularly with *jánman-* to refer to "both breeds/races [of gods and men]" (e.g., I.31.7, II.6.7, X.37.11), and I therefore "borrow" *jánman-* from pāda b to be head noun, in slightly different sense, for *ubháyam* in c. Given the emphasis on kinship, esp. the shared kinship of gods and men, in this section of the hymn, I am sure this is the primary reading. However, given also the stress on gender opposition in this vs., 'both' here might refer

to women and men, or mothers and fathers, with an alternative tr. "... support both (males and females / mothers and fathers) ..."

X.64.15: Note the opening figure *ví ṣā̆ ... víśva(m)*.

The lexeme *ví √naś* here is generally rendered 'attains, acquires' (Ge "erlangt," Re "atteint"), without registering the *ví*. But in nearby X.67.7 the VP *drávi̯ṇam vy ā̆naṭ* "he reached through to the treasure" is found in a Vala context, with Bṛhaspati as subject, and 'reach *through*' is therefore appropriate. He reaches into the Vala cave from outside to take possession of its contents. Since Bṛhaspati is one of the subjects here, I think the lexeme has its full semantic value in our passage as well. For disc. of other uses of *ví √naś* see comm. ad X.27.20.

The passive *ucyáte* (with passive accent) occurs three times with *grā̆van-* 'pressing stone' as subj. (our passage = X.100.8, as well as V.25.8 with the same phrase in a simile, *grā̆vevocyate bṛhát*). This quite well-attested verb form otherwise has undoubted passive value in the sense 'be called' or, much less frequently, 'is spoken'. Neither sense works here; the standard response is to tr. it as a simple intrans. 'sounds, speaks' (Ge "erklingt," Re "parle," Scar [615] "spricht"), but this ignores the unequivocal passive morphology. It almost seems like the passive to a causative, 'is made to speak' (though *vācayati* is not attested till Vedic prose and we would expect its passive to be **vācyáte*). I tr. 'is given voice' to capture the passive formation and the lack of agency of the stone, in contrast to the "inspired thinkers" (*manīṣíṇaḥ*) of the next pāda, who bellow.

The rt noun cmpd with the shape *madhu-ṣúd* in context appears to contain the root *√su* 'press' (*-sú-t*), and it is generally so analyzed (e.g., Gr, Scars 615) and so rendered in the publ. tr. (and in the standard tr.). Nonetheless, I wonder if there is semantic overlap with the root(s) *√svad / sūd* 'sweeten, prepare' of ritual offerings. *havya-sū̆d-* occurs twice, and there is a single occurrence of *saṃ-súd-* with short root vowel (VIII.17.6), ordinarily ascribed to *√svad*, but see my doubts ad loc. As Scar (626) says, "Die Alternation °*sū̆d-* ~ °*-súd-* ist offenbar metrisch ausgenützt worden." Since the form in our passage is nom. sg., the final *-d* in sandhi could either be the automatic voicing result of the empty *-t* added to °*su-* 'press', or simply reflect the voiced root final of °*sū̆d* 'sweeten'. (Though there are two other occurrences of *madhu-ṣút/d-*, n of them is in a phonologically diagnostic position.) Note that a reading with long vowel *-sū̆d-* here would produce a slightly better break, but not better enough to justify emendation.

It is not possible to decide whether cd forms a separate sentence, with c dependent on the main clause in d – or whether they are parallel clauses and both dependent on the main clause of ab. I have opted for the latter, along with Re and HPS (B+I 127), while Ge and Scar (615) prefer the former. Fortunately almost nothing rests on the choice; I went for independent sentences because cd don't seem integrally connected with ab semantically.

X.64.16–17: The final vs. of the hymn, 17, is identical to the final vs. of X.63, also 17. Our vs. 16 essentially doubles vs. 17, with relexification. Both begin with a hymn-summary *evā̆* followed by a nom. of the poet (16 *kavíḥ*, 17 *platéḥ sūnúḥ*), who is later identified as Gaya (16d, 17d). Both vss. contain an augmented redupl. aor. with the general sense 'strengthen' (16d *ápīpayat* 'has swelled', 17a *avīvṛdhat* 'has strengthened') whose obj. is the gods or a subset thereof (16d *divyā̆ni jánma* "the divine races," 17ab *vo víśva ādityā adite* "you, o all you Ādityas and Aditi" [or "... o All (Gods), Ādityas, and Aditi"; see comm. ad 63.17]), with the *divyā̆ni jánma* of 16d nearly matched by *jáno divyáḥ* in 17d. Vs. 16 fills out the rest of its bulk with qualifications of the poet and his aims, while the second hemistich of 17 rephrases and emphasizes the poet's act

of praising.

X.64.16: The phrase *kavís tuvīrávān*, used here of the poet Gaya, is repeated from vs. 4, where it qualifies Bṛhaspati; Gaya is obviously identifying himself with that eloquent god. See HPS (B+I 127) for further spec.

X.65–66 All Gods

On the poet of these two hymns, Vasukarṇa Vāsukra, and his relatives see the publ. intro. to X.65 – also for the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain that ends both hymns.

X.65 All Gods

I now think that this hymn contains a demarcated omphalos section in vss. 1–9, consisting of a pair of responsive verses, 5–6, and a series of enclosing rings: 1/9, 2/8. 4/7. This structure was not clear to me at the time of the translation and published intro., and details will be given below.

X.65.1: This has to be the easiest RVic verse to translate of all the ca. 10,000 vss. in the text – consisting as it does of a series of divine names in the nom., along with a couple of adjectives. Happily the hymn doesn't stay at this level of simplicity. Despite its simplicity, it occupies an important place in the architecture of the hymn, forming a ring with vs. 9, which likewise contains an enumeration of gods' names, many of them shared with vs. 1, viz. Indra, Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman, Vāyu, the Ādityas, and Aditi.

X.65.2: The two nom. sgs. that begin vs. 1, *agnír índraḥ*, appear in reverse order in the dual dvandva that opens vs. 2, *indrāgnī́*, which is to be read quadrisyllabically here—as often, but not invariably, elsewhere. In these quadrisyllabic readings, because the distracted syllable is surrounded by heavy syllables (*indr* and *agn*), its quantity cannot be definitely determined. However, almost all the distracted forms are pāda-initial (as here), and heavy 2nd syllables are favored in trimeter vs. A reading *indrā-agnī́* following this pattern would contain the dual *-ā* expected in dual dvandvas (like *índr**ā**-váruṇā*) – but it must be noted that the other dvandva containing Indra that has only one accent, namely *indr**a**-vāyū́*, contains the stem form. So a reading *indra-agnī́* is far from excluded. For further on this cmpd see comm. ad VII.35.1.

The phrase *mithó hinvānā́ tanvā̀* "spurring each other on mutually" is reminiscent of IV.56.6 *punāné tanvā̀ mithā́ḥ* "purifying their own bodies / each other mutually," of Heaven and Earth. See also X.28.12 *yé hinviré tanvàḥ* "who urged themselves / each other on," adduced by Old -- keeping in mind that X.28 is attributed to Vasukra, and our poet has the patronymic Vāsukra.

The final word of the first hemistich, *sámokasā* 'sharing the same home', is found in the same position in 8b, thus providing the first inner ring. In vs. 8 it is used of Heaven and Earth, not Indra and Agni.

The subject shifts abruptly from the dual of ab to pl., signaled only by the 3rd pl. verb *ā́ papruḥ* in c. The default 3rd pl. subject would presumably be the All Gods or else the enumerated list of gods in vs. 1. The next hymn, by the same poet, contains the same VP: X.66.9c *antárikṣam ... ā́ papruḥ ...* "they filled the midspace," where the gods (*devā́saḥ* 9d) are the likely subj. However, since Soma is found independently in our pāda d, it would be possible to interpret the subj. of *ā́ papruḥ* as Indra+Agni plus Soma, though this seems artificial to me.

Scar (550–51) suggests a number of possible interpr. of *ghṛta-śrī-* (4x), without making a definite decision among them. I opted for the simplest, 'glorious through ghee', rather than, say, "durch die Schmelzbutter vollkommen [gemacht]." Two of the four occurrences of this stem modify Agni (I.128.4, V.8.3), and ghee is of course completely at home in Agni contexts. One modifies Heaven and Earth, in a passage (VI.70.4), indeed a hymn, where ghee figures prominently as an attribute of H+E – perhaps a reference to rain? But the relevance of ghee to Soma is less clear; judging from the use of the independent stem *ghṛtá-* in Maṇḍala IX, it is used there to refer to the milk with which the soma is mixed, perhaps to indicate how rich and unctuous that milk is. On *-śrī-* cmpds in general see comm. ad III.26.5 and on this cmpd in particular I.128.4. In these comments I have come round to the possibility of a transitive interpr. of this compound: "bringing the ghee to the perfection," which is perhaps best in the Agni contexts. I suppose it is thinkable here, but less compelling.

X.65.3: My construal of the instr. *mahnā́* differs from that of Ge and Re. They take it as a sort of internal instr. with gen. pl. *mahatā́m* "of those great by their greatness," while I construe it with the 1st sg. verb "By [or perhaps, because of] their greatness I rouse my praises." Although an internal reading is likely in I.166.11 *mahā́nto mahnā́*, in the other two passages Gr ascribes this syntax to (nearby X.67.12=X.111.4) the *mahnā́* also goes with the verb; the standard tr. agree (see also HPS, B+I, 227).

Note that *iyarmi* responds to the part. *īráyan* in 2d, which is built to the secondary *-áya-* stem arising from the redupl. pres. represented by *iyarmi* (weak form *īr-*).

Note the scrambled phonetic figure of *anarváṇām* (a) and (*-am) arṇavám* (c); *arṇavám* also participates in a rhyme figure with immed. preceding *apsavám*.

With Ge (n. 3c) I consider *apsavá-* an irregular deriv. to the loc. pl. *apsú*, which, as Ge points out, sometimes serves as a pseudo-stem (*apsu-kṣít-*, etc.). By contrast, Gr considers it a cmpd. with *-savá-*, glossing the cmpd 'Wasser spendend' -- with the 2nd member *savá-* 'impulse, stimulus' belonging to √*sū* 'impel'. But 'water' does not appear to serve as an object to this verb and the semantics would have to be somewhat attenuated. It's also worth noting that uncompounded *savá-* 'impulse' never appears in a context without at least one other form from √*sū*. Although AiG II.2.96 follows the *-savá-* interpr., Deb does point out that it would have to be a nom. agentis here, though *savá-* and its various cmpds with preverbs are nom. actionis – another argument against this interpr.

However we interpr. *apsavá-*, we must reckon with the absence of a verb in the rel. cl. of c. Ge (n. 3c) supplies the verb from the main cl. in d (*rāsantām*). But this brings the further problem of how to construe the acc. phrase *apsavám arṇavám*. The easiest solution is Ge's, to take it as obj. of the supplied 'give' ("die die Wasserflut (spenden)"), but I think we are hoping the gods will give us something more appealing than water. I take the bahuvrīhi *citrá-rādhas-* lit. 'possessing bright bounties' as pregnantly expressing our hope: that the gods who possess these bounties will grant them to us. As for the acc. *apsavám arṇavám*, I take it as an unsignaled acc. of extent: "(across) the watery flood" – the space that the gods will traverse in bringing these gifts. Cf., e.g., I.19.7 *tiráḥ samudrám arṇavám*, as well as the famous introductory verse of the Yama/Yamī hymn X.10.1 *tiráḥ purū́ cid arṇaváṃ jaganvā́n*. Re's solution is even more radical: he seems to supply the verb 'possess' extracted from the bahuvrīhi *citrá-rādhas-* and construe *apsavám arṇavám* as its obj. "eux qui ... (possèdent) l'océan aux (riches) eaux," a syntactic sleight of hand that stretches the boundaries (but which I sneakily admire).

Pāda d poses its own problems. Most importantly, the morphological identity and

function of *maháye* are unclear. The standard view (Gr, Ge, Re) is that it's a dative infinitive; Gr assigns it to a hapax stem *mahí-* (different form the NA *máhi*), while in contrast Re asserts that the infinitive is built to the *-áya-* verbal stem *maháya-*. (Ge does not pronounce on the morphology, though his tr. ["um (unseren Mut) zu erhöhen"] reflects an infinitival interpr.) Neither of the morphological analyses is appealing. Though *-ti*-stems regularly build *-taye* infinitives, dative infinitives to straight *-i*-stems are fewer and less well established, save for a few well-known exx. like *dṛśáye*; see Keydana's detailed disc. (*Infinitive im Ṛgveda* 212–19), which concludes with an indecisive treatment of this very form and passage. But Re's solution seems to invent a category: treating the *-áy-* of the verb stem as if it were a root noun onto which a dative *-e* could be slapped. He also fails to mention that the standard way to make an infinitive to *-áya*-stems is with *-dhyai* – e.g., *mādayádhyai*, *vartayádhyai*; we should expect **mahayádhyai* here. I propose a more radical reinterp.: to take *maháye* as a finite verb, the 1st sg. middle of the verb stem *maháya-* 'magnify', beginning a new clause and therefore accented. Though most of the forms to this stem are act., 1st sg. verbs of praising have a tendency towards middle voice, and see also the technically middle *-anta* replacement form in III.3.3. If *maháye* is a 1st sg., it echoes the semantically similar *stómāṁ iyarmi* in pāda b; see also *maháyantaḥ* in the next vs. (4c).

However, this reconfiguration of the syntax requires a different interpr. of following *sumitryā́ḥ*, which must then belong to the *maháye* clause. This form, found only here in the RV, is standardly taken as nom. pl. masc. agreeing with the *té*, subject of *rāsantām*, but that is not possible under my new interpr. of *maháye*. I take it as a fem. acc. pl., modifying **víśaḥ* '(heavenly) clans' to be supplied. Although this might seem arbitrary, note that in nearby X.69 (not attributed to the same poet, however), vs. 1 contains the phrase *sumitrā́ víśaḥ* "well-allied clans," with the base adj. *sumitrá-*. For divine clans, see, e.g., VIII.75.8 *devā́nāṃ víśaḥ*.

X.65.4: The phonetic manipulation found in the last vs., with the pair *anarváṇam ... -am arṇavám*, continued by the first word in this vs. (*s*^{u}*)varṇaram*. Note also the final words of c and d: *surātáyaḥ*# ... *sūráyaḥ*#.

On *svàrṇara-* see comm. ad IX.70.6.

The opening of b is striking for the *pṛthivī́m* doubling the second member of the dual dvandva *dyā́vābhū́mī*. As Ge points out (n. 4b), a similar doubling is found in the phrase *dyā́vākṣā́mā pṛthivī́* in I.102.2, III.8.8 (on which see comm. ad I.102.2). In such configurations *pṛthivī́-* may show its origin as an epithet of the earth ('the broad one') rather a word for earth itself.

On *skambhuḥ* see comm. ad VI.72.2, where the competing interpr. as de-redupl. pf. or root aor. are weighed and Kü's extensive disc. is noted. As indicated there, I do not have a strong feeling either way, but Kü's desire to see a "generell-zeitlos" sense in the contexts of these verbs, to justify an aor. injunctive interpr., seems to me unnecessary.

The phrase that occupies the whole first hemistich, ACCs *skambhur ójasā* "they propped up ACCs with their might" is echoed by 7c *dyā́ṃ skabhitvī́ ... ójasā* "having propped up heaven with their might." "Heaven" is one of the objects in 4ab, in the dvandva *dyā́vābhū́mi*.

On *pṛkṣá-* see comm. ad II.34.3.

The participle *maháyantaḥ*, though picking up *maháye* from 3d, has the gods as subject. This may be a playful reversal on the poet's part, since his audience would expect humans to be the subj. The last pāda also presents the gods in a role generally associated with humans, that of "(sacrificial) patron" (*sūrí-*), a role they also assume in the next hymn (X.66.2). For the object of

mahâyantaḥ I borrow the accusatives from ab; Ge supplies "Mut," Re "l'homme," with no obvious support for either choice.

X.65.5: Ge (flg. Ludwig) and Re construe *dāśúṣe* at the end of pāda a with the rel. cl. that occupies the next pāda (e.g., Ge: "die gegen die Spender ... nie gleichgütig werden"). This is (barely) syntactically possible: the rel. pronoun *yā́* would be in 2nd position flg this dative. However, I think this type of configuration is unlikely (/nonexistent?) when the rel. prn. opens a pāda. Moreover, dat. *dāśúṣe* immediately follows dative *váruṇāya*, which adjacency suggests they belong together. *Especially* because the very same phrase, *váruṇāya dāśúṣe*, occurs in the very same position in the following vs. (6c; see also X.113.5), where both Ge and Re bow to the need to construe them together (and in n. 5a Ge expresses doubts about his interpr. of the word in 5). The four-square construction of vs. 5, with a clause occupying each pāda (the last three of which are introduced by rel. prns.) also speaks against their interpr. Obviously the reason Ge/Re separated the two datives in this vs. is that *dāśvā́ṃs-* is almost exclusively applied to humans (though see comm. ad II.19.4, X.104.6). But we have already noted, in the previous vs. (4), this hymn's tendency to attribute human ritual roles to gods, and this would be the same phenomenon.

In fact the agreement between vss. 5 and 6 on the responsive phrase *váruṇāya dāśúṣe* defines these central verses as an omphalos, and I think the role reversal -- with Varuṇa playing the part of the pious worshiper and doing service, implicitly, to us -- is the uninsistent "message" of the omphalos.

Pāda c is notable for containing both *dhā́man-* and *dhárman-*, which, however, seem easy to separate in this context.

On *vṛ́t-* see comm. ad VII.98.4.

nā́dhasī is a hapax. See Old's disc. He flirts with the poss. of a long-*ī* loc., but opts in the end for a dual.

X.65.6: Flg. Ge (n. 6a), I tentatively interpr. the cow as the offering ladle; there is similar phraseology in III.7.2, as he points out.

Note the echoes between *vartaním* (a) and *vratanī́ḥ* (b), already pointed out by Old – to which we can add immed. flg. *avārátaḥ*. All of these prepare the way for *váruṇāya* in c.

In the rt. noun cmpd. *vratanī́-*, rather than taking *vrata-* as the obj. of *-nī́-* (e.g., Re: "qui conduit le voeu (divine)," I interpr. it as an instr. adverbial, "leading according to / by / at the commandment (of Varuṇa)." For a very similar configuration see X.16.2 *devā́nāṃ vaśanī́ḥ* "leading at the will of the gods" and comm. ad loc. I supply "of Varuṇa" because he is the standard possessor of *vrata*s, and he is quite prominent in this set of vss. (5–6, 8). See esp. 8c *váruṇāya sávrate* "(the two) obeying the same commandment to Varuṇa."

My interpr. of *avārátaḥ* roughly follows Ge's (who follows Sāy.'s), namely that it is derived from √*vṝ* 'choose'. Both Sāy. and Ge think it means "without seeking something for herself" (Ge: "ohne sich etwas auszubitten"), whereas my "not by choice" is in implicit contrast to *vratanī́ḥ* "leading by the commandment (of Varuṇa)" – that is, she does not control her own ritual movements but follows what has been established by Varuṇa. However, it is easier to get the Say./Ge meaning, from *vā́ra-* 'choice (thing), thing of value' (through accent shift in the adverbial *-taḥ* formation [see, e.g., *ubháya-* : *ubhayátaḥ*]), than from *vára-* 'choice', so 'not because of a thing of value' is a possible alternative. It must be admitted, however, that the Sāy./Ge/SJ interpr. of this form is not the standard one, which is as a deriv. of *ávara-* 'near

(side), with *avārátaḥ* supposedly meaning 'from here / this side' (e.g., Re: "de ce côté-ci"). See Gr, AiG III.591, EWA s.v. *ávara-*; although the long *ā* might seem to be a stumbling block, VS (+) has *avārá-* 'the nearer (bank)', *avāryà-* 'near(er)', matching the semantic opposite, *pārá-* 'far bank' beside *pára-* 'farther' (see esp. AiG III.591). The problem for me is that 'from this side', even interpr. as 'from this world', doesn't make much sense in context.

I take the middle part. *prabruvāṇā́* as passive (or possibly reflexive, 'announcing herself'); so also Re. However Ge supplies "(das Opfer)" as obj., and it is true that most of the forms of this part. take an object. Nonetheless, though the interpr. is possible, I don't think supplying an object is necessary.

Note the allit. *dāśúṣe, devébhyo dāśad dhavíṣā*, with the allit. of the last word produced by sandhi. On the responsion of *váruṇāya dāśúṣe* with 5a, see above.

X.65.7–8: The poet takes pleasure in mixing and contrasting forms from the two phonologically similar roots √*kṣi* 'dwell' and √*kṣā* rule': 7a *divakṣasaḥ*, 8a *parikṣitā*, 8b *kṣayataḥ*, along with, as a wild card, *sámokasā* to an entirely different root.

X.65.7: The adj. found here as nom. pl. *divákṣasaḥ* (also as gen. sg. in III.7.2; nom. sg. *divákṣā(s)* III.30.21) raises a number of formal and semantic questions. It is ordinarily (Gr, Ge, Re) taken to mean 'dwelling in heaven', even though already in AiG II.1 (1905) Wack assigned its second member to √*kṣā* 'rule' (II.1.127, etc.), an analysis fld by EWA (I.427) and Scar (92–93). If the 1st member *divá-* stands for gen. sg. *divás* (gen. cmpl. to verb of ruling), as Wack. takes it, the absent final *-s* needs explanation. Wack (loc. cit.) attributes it to the loss of final *-s* before a cluster consisting of stop + sibilant (his three exx. all involve *-kṣ-*), somewhat refined by Scar to dissimilatory cluster simplification (with ? after "dissimilatorische"). If the 2nd member is a root noun, we need also to account for the 1st-member accent and, even more crucially, the apparent *s*-stem gen. sg. / nom. pl. These could be explained by positing not a root-noun 2nd member, but an *-as* stem built to the zero-grade root, as Scar suggests, which seems to me to be the best overall solution. But this makes the nom. sg. in III.30.21 problematic, because it immediately precedes *asi* in a pāda that has two many syllables. An asigmatic *divákṣā* + *asi*, contracted to **divákṣāsi*, would provide a metrical solution, but neither a root noun nor an *as*-stem should be asigmatic in the nom. sg. (See comm. ad loc. for the likely double-sandhi solution, provided by HvN.) For the various formal problems in these forms see Scar's disc. (92–93). His positing of a parallel *-an*-stem to account for the nom. sg. in III.30.21 seems de trop, but the *-as*-stem he suggests instead of a root noun seems quite plausible.

On the anomalous accent of the bahuvrīhi *agni-jihvā́-* see AiG II.1.297, which, however, does not give a satisfactory account of it.

The lexeme *ví* √*mṛś* is found in the RV only here and in X.88.16, in the AV at AVŚ XIII.1.8 = AVP XVIII.15.8. Although the root √*mṛś* clearly means 'touch', often in a forthrightly physical sense (see the hyper-sexual *úpopa me párā mṛśa* in I.126.7 and the sad fate of the gambler's wife in X.34.4 *anyé jāyā́m pári mṛśanty asya*), the standard tr. attenuate the meaning here to something like "think about" (Ge's gloss "überdenkend" of his own tr. "befühlend"; Re's "considérant-en-leur-pensée"). These mental interpr. are probably based on the other attestation of the lexeme in X.88.16 *mánasā vímṛṣṭam* "'stroked' by his mind," but surely the *mánasā* there is meant to signal that the use of √*mṛś* is metaphorical, rather than to indicate that the root itself has a fundamental mental rather than physical application. In the same manner that I always argue when the standard interpr. flatten or attenuate the sense of a word or

lexeme, I would point out here that the RV has numerous roots that fall squarely in the domain of thinking, considering, etc., and therefore when the poet chooses to use instead a fairly rare root with a specific, non-mental sense, he is aiming to plug that specific sense into a context that might not seem immediately receptive to it – such is the RVic poetic enterprise.

What the gods are stroking is the *ṛtásya yóni-* 'womb of truth', a common trope for the ritual ground (see also 8b). Here it probably refers to the part of the ground prepared as seats for the gods, where in fact they are sitting (*āsate*). Although I considered the possibility that *vimṛśánta āsate* is a periphrasis for the present progressive, with √*ās* as an auxiliary ("keep stroking" vel sim.), I think we should take *āsate* in its full lexical value here as indicating the gods' physical location and posture at the ritual.

The 2nd hemistich contains two examples of the *-tvī́* gerund, *skabhitvī́* (c) and *janitvī́* (d). The example in c, *dyā́m skabhitvī́ ... ójasā*, echoes 4b *dyā́vābhū́mī ... skambhur ójasā*, and this echo suggests that *ójasā* in our pāda should be construed with the gerund, not the finite verb, despite the word order (and *pace* Ge, Re, and the publ. tr.): "having propped up heaven with their might, they ..." On this phrase as making a ring with the more expansive phrase in 4ab, see disc. there.

The verb in d, *māmṛjuḥ*, belongs to the root √*mṛj* 'wipe', which is phonologically similar to, and in some derivatives phonetically indistinguishable from, √*mṛś*, which we met in b. The roots are semantically similar as well, particularly in idioms like this. For the sense of *ní* √*mṛj* 'clasp (to oneself)', see comm. ad II.38.2, VII.26.3, X.39.14. The intimate physical relationship between the gods and the sacrifice is strongly signaled in these two pādas (b, d). The post-caesura portion of this pāda, *tanvì ní māmṛjuḥ*, is also found in the next hymn, X.66.9, though with a different object. See disc. there.

X.65.8: The rt noun cmpd *parikṣít-* occurs 3x in the RV, always in the dual. Twice (here and III.7.1) it is used of Heaven and Earth identified as *pitárā*. (The third occurrence, in I.123.7, is usually also interpr. as H+E, but I prefer Night and Dawn there; see comm. ad loc.) How exactly it applies to H+E is a little uncertain. I take it to mean that they 'encircle' or 'surround' the space between them, that is the surface of the earth where human life takes place and the midspace, here perhaps defined more narrowly as the ritual ground that is the conceptual center of this space. It is mildly noteworthy that the occurrence of this cmpd in III.7.1 is found in a vs. immediately preceding one of the three occurrences of *divákṣas-* (III.7.2), which here is found in similar proximity, in the preceding vs., X.65.7.

Like X.64.14 in the immediately preceding hymn (attributed to a different poet), this vs. plays on the different genders of the gendered pair Heaven and Earth. Their dual designation here, *pitárā* 'two fathers' (for '(mother and) father'), of course explicitly references the masc., and the preceding dual adj. *parikṣítā* could be equally masc. or fem. But the immediately following adj. *pūrvajā́varī* is not only fem. but has the archaic, inherited, synchronically suppletive fem. *-ar(-ī)* suffix associated with *-an*-stems (type *pī́van- / pī́varī-*). Discomfort with the gender mismatch is perhaps conveyed by Re's curious tr. of *pitárā* as "les deux mères" – or it may be a rare lapse.

The finite verb in b, *kṣayataḥ*, is perfectly ambiguous: it can be the pres. indicative of √*kṣā* 'rule', as the publ. tr. takes it, or the pres. subjunctive of √*kṣi* 'dwell': 'they two will dwell'. Opinions are divided: Ge, HPS (Vrata 97), and Scar (92) opt for "herrschen" (though Ge allows for either in n. 8b); Re and JPB (Ādityas 110–11) for 'rule' (though Re doesn't tr. as subjunctive). I now think that choosing one is unduly restrictive, given the apparently deliberate

fluidity of the *-kṣ-* forms in these two vss., and would now slightly emend the tr. to "rule / will dwell."

The final word of the pāda b, *sámokasā* 'having the same house', appears to echo the first word of vs. 7, *divákṣasaḥ*, esp. for those who interpret the latter as 'dwelling in heaven' (rather than 'ruling over heaven', as is now the norm; see above). But even though *ókas* contributes to the *-kṣ-* play in this sequence as well as to the semantic play, it is of course etymologically unrelated to √*kṣi*, and it also repeats the same word in 2b, and therefore provides one of the supporting rings for the omphalos structure.

I construe *váruṇāya* with *sávrate* since vratas are Varuṇa's special province. The question then is whether the dat. *mahiṣā́ya* in the next pāda is coreferential with *váruṇāya*, as in the publ. tr. (as well as explicitly Gr, Re, JPB [Ādit. 110–11]). If, as Ge and JPB assert, the "ghee-filled milk" is really rain, a substance that H+E do indeed have in their control, then the identification makes sense, esp. given Varuṇa's growing association with the waters. (That the next vs. begins with the dvandva *parjányā-vā́tā*, two divinities associated with storm and the atmosphere may support the 'rain' interpr.) But if the *ghṛtávat páyaḥ* is more closely tied to the ritual, a different referent might be more appropriate, esp. since, as far as I know, this would be the only passage in which Varuṇa is identified as a *mahiṣá-*. Indra and Soma are both regularly called *mahiṣá-* and both would be likely beneficiaries of the swelling of milk on the ritual ground. It is, of course, quite possible, that *mahiṣā́ya* is meant to be ambiguous here.

X.65.9: This enumerative vs. seems to return us to vs. 1, though the syntactic frame changes in midstream: ab are presumably in the nominative (though this is signaled only by the last three words, the singulars *váruṇo mitró aryamā́* – the rest is in the dual and could just as well be acc.), but the divinities in c are in the acc. and the objects of *havāmahe*. Since I now think this verse forms the outer ring of the omphalos portion of the hymn, matching vs. 1, I would withdraw the statement in the publ. intro. that "the hymn seems to begin anew with vs. 9," though it does also provide a transition to the last part of the hymn, esp. vs. 10.

As was just noted, the dvandva *parjányā-vā́tā* seems to pick up the theme of rain from 8d, esp. given the adj. *purīṣíṇā* 'overflowing'. Ge also appositely cites VI.49.6 on this quality.

The final pāda is an expansion of the enumeration in a relative clause – a variant of the "X and which Y" type, without overt conjunction. It is oddly framed by a rel. prn. at the beginning and the end: #*yé* ... *yé*#. All three terms in between are locational, but the first two are adjectives in the nom. pl., the last a locative. A slightly more faithful tr. might be "(those) who are earthly (and) heavenly (and) who are in the waters," with the two *yé*'s associated with the two different constructions.

X.65.10: Another enumerative vs., this time couched entirely in the acc. These accusatives are presumably governed by *īmahe* 'we beseech', which is the absolute final word of the vs., though it's possible instead to carry over *havāmahe* 'we summon' from the previous vs. (9c); it hardly matters.

The rel. prn. *yá* in the Saṃhitā text could reflect either sg. *yáḥ* or pl. *yé*. Either would be possible in context, since there are potential antecedents in both sg. (Tvaṣṭar, Vāyu) and pl. (Ṛbhus) and the verb in the rel. cl., *óhate*, can also be sg. or pl. (see below). Most tr. and interpr. (incl. the publ. tr.) opt for the sg. *yáḥ*, flg. the Pp as well as Sāy., with Vāyu as the likely antecedent (and voc. *ṛbhavaḥ* interposed). I would not rule out a pl. interpr. with *ṛbhavaḥ* as antecedent, since a rel. cl. dependent on a voc., even a rel. cl. in the 3rd ps., does not seem wildly

outlandish to me. This would produce an alt. tr. "... o (you) Ṛbhus, who vaunt themselves." Since the rel. cl. has no specific content – every god is always available for praise or self-praise – there are no contextual clues that favor one interpr. over the other. I favor the sg. interpr., since it avoids the implicit change of person. It is also possible that the rel. cl. identifies another individual who vaunts himself or who (per Ge, Re, JSK [Part. *u* 162]) considers himself an Ṛbhu, but this seems to introduce further syntactic complications without much gain in content.

The verb *óhate* and its relatives are slippery both morphologically and functionally, as was disc. esp. ad V.52.10. A number of its occurrences belong to a root present; see the athematic participle, *óhāna-* ~ *ohāná-* and the clear (II.23.16, V.52.10, 11) or likely (VII.66.12) 3rd pl. *óhate*. However, most of the occurrences of *óhate* are singular (as is 2nd sg. *ohase* VIII.80.9; on *ohase* in I.30.4, see comm. ad loc.). These presumably began life as subjunctives to the root present, but subjunctive value is not prominent or necessary in a number of passages (like this one), and it seems likely that the stem *óha-* was reinterpr. as a 1st class present. On the morphology see Narten (Fs. Kuiper 10–12 = KlSch 98–100) and Gotō (1st Kl. 81). As for semantics, see comm. ad V.52.10. Although a few forms appear to be transitive with the sense 'solemnly proclaim, praise' (esp. I.30.4, VII.16.11) like some forms of the corresponding Aves. verb √*aog*, most are either reflexive 'proclaim oneself (as), vaunt oneself' or passive 'are praised (as)'. (Most of the passages Gr identifies as having an acc. obj. should be otherwise interpr; see the publ. tr. of and comm. on the particular passages.) Verbs of praising have a tendency to slip into reflexive and then passive value.

The epithet *vṛtrakhādá-* 'gnawer of Vṛtra' occurs 3x in the RV, twice clearly of Indra (as we might expect) (III.45.2, 51.9). Here it appears to modify Bṛhaspati, since it is placed between the name Bṛhaspati and an epithet that is more appropriate to that god, *sumedhás-* 'of good wisdom'. Since gnawing Vṛtra is distant from Bṛhaspati's usual sphere of operations, we might interpr. the epithet here as indirectly inserting Indra in the list of invoked deities; or we can simply take the assignment of the epithet to Bṛhaspati at face value. Certainly HPS (B+I 32) takes it as modifying B.

Although *dhanasā́(ḥ)* is simply a nom. pl. modifier of the unexpressed subj. ("we") of *īmahe*, it may implicitly express purpose ("so that / such that we win the stakes").

I do not understand the position and function of *u*. JSK (Part. *u* 162) suggests that it's conjoining *havāmahe* (9c) and *īmahe* (10d). I would almost prefer to claim that it connects the morphologically non-parallel purpose expressions *svastáye* (b) and *dhanasā́(ḥ)* (d).

X.65.11: This vs. contains three predicated pres. participles (a: *janáyanta(ḥ)*, c: *roháyantaḥ*, d: *visṛjántaḥ*) in the nom. plural and no finite verb. This structure is particularly clear because the vs. cannot be taken as syntactically dependent on the previous vs., whose 1st pl. subj. "we" cannot perform the cosmogonic deeds described in this vs., or as anticipating the next vs., whose subj. is the Aśvins in the 2nd dual. The plural subject in our vs. is not identified, but presumably it's the gods in general or some subset of them, perhaps the ones invoked in the previous vs(s).

X.65.12: Four of the Aśvins' good deeds, briskly summarized one per pāda. The tenses are oddly varied: a: pres. *pipṛthaḥ*; b: aug. impf. *ajinvatam*; c: pf. *ūhathuḥ*; d: pres. *sṛjathaḥ*. I have no explanation for this temporal grab bag.

On Viṣṇāpū see Remmer (Frauennamen 39–40) and comm. ad X.39.7.

X.65.13: And now we have a nomenclatural grab bag. On Pāvīravī see Remmer (96), though there is little to say. The name is also found in VI.49.7, which also contains Sarasvatī; the previous vs. in that hymn, VI.49.6, also has the dual dvandva *parjányāvā́tā* found in our vs. 9, in similar context.

X.65.14: Pāda a condenses the second hemistich of vs. 13, though eliminating Sarasvatī; the second pāda simply expands on *víśve devā́ḥ*.

On the *rātiṣā́c-* see comm. ad VIII.28.2; on *abhiṣā́c-* see Scar (587–88). It's worth noting that in III.51.2 *abhiṣā́c-* is immediately followed by *svarvíd-*, as it is here.

Ge takes *svàr* in d as part of the subject, rather than part of the object as I (and Scar) do; Re has a more complex take. Although removing *svàr* from the object phrase produces a more thematically unified object (songs, formulation, and hymn – all verbal products), the pāda break speaks for the acc. interpr., as does the fact that the subjects are "sun-finders" and so should not include the sun him/itself.

X.65.15: The 2nd hemistich is identical to VII.35.15 (likewise a hymn-final vs.), whose pāda b is identical to our 14b. The final pāda of our vs. and of VII.35.15 is of course the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain, and it is therefore at home in VII.35 in the Vasiṣṭha maṇḍala. VII.35 is an enumerative hymn, like this one, and includes some of the same minor divinities: the Escorts and Gift-escorts (VII.35.11c), Sarasvatī along with insights (11b), and Aja Ekapad (13a). The first pāda of our vs. also identifies Vasiṣṭha as the praiser in our hymn. It is not possible to say whether our poet is borrowing the mantle of Vasiṣṭha or belongs to Vasiṣṭha's poetic lineage, or perhaps just plundered VII.35. See the publ. intro. for indecisive disc.

X.66 All Gods

This hymn is even more focused on divine enumeration than the last one and contains a capacious catalogue, including many minor divinities. In this it is even closer to the spirit of VII.35 than X.65 is. Its final vs. is identical to the immed. preceding hymn, X.65.15, and thus also links the hymn to Vasiṣṭha. In fact the penultimate vs. (X.66.14) makes a strong claim to the poetic lineage of the Vasiṣṭhas and their eponymous ancestor.

X.66.2: Since the *yé* at the beginning of the second pāda follows an opening pāda containing only a single constituent, I consider it to have domain over the whole hemistich, which provides a more satisfactory structure.

On *mánma dhīmahi* see comm. ad X.36.5.

With Ge and Re (also AiG II.2.132) I take *mā́ghone* as an abstract, 'generosity'. It is tempting, however, to interpret this vṛddhi deriv. of *maghávan-* as more directly related to the usual referent of that epithet, i.e., as meaning 'associated with the Maghavan=Indra', and construe it with *vṛjáne* in c, as a parallel to *marúdgaṇe*: "... on the community having the Maruts as their troop and associated with Indra." This is exactly what Sāy. does (*māghone maghavata indrasya saṃbandhini*). Given the pāda break I think the Ge/Re/publ.tr. interpr. is probably better, but the other is at least lurking.

As in its companion hymn X.65, pāda d attributes ritual roles to the gods that are usually filled by mortals; see comm. ad X.65.4.

X.66.4: The first hemistich is couched in the nominative, although only the first term, *áditiḥ*, is unequivocally nom.; the others could alternatively be acc., because they are dual dvandvas, neuters, or, in the case of *marútaḥ*, a consonant stem identical in nom./acc. pl. The second half-verse is entirely and unequivocally in the acc., to be construed with *havāmahe*.

X.66.5: *sárasvān dhībhíḥ* is a variant of *sárasvatī sahá dhībhiḥ* in the preceding hymn (X.65.13; cf. also VII.35.11). The masc. figure *sárasvant-* is of course far less prominent than the goddess/river Sarasvatī. I do not now why he was introduced here as a substitute for the feminine.

The abstract *mahimā̃* 'Greatness' is an anomaly in the list of gods' names in b, though of course English speakers would have no trouble interpreting (His/Your) Highness or (His/Your) Majesty in such a list. Re's suggestion that it is the Greatness of Indra seems plausible; see the passages cited by Ge (n. 5b) where *mahimán-* stands in for Indra.

Ge's suggestion (n. 5c) that the Maruts are the formulation-makers (*brahmakṛ́taḥ*) also seems plausible. As we see in passages like V.52.1, 5 the Maruts are praisers as well as recipients of praise.

X.66.6: It is unclear how large the domain of the impv. *santu* is. I take it as extending through the whole vs., or at least the first hemistich (with appropriate adjustment in number), while Ge's tr. implies that only the 2nd part of pāda a falls under its sway. In a verse of this banality it scarcely matters.

The unbroken predication of *vṛ́ṣan-* in a series is strongly reminiscent of the first part of the Atri hymn V.40, esp. vss. 1–3.

X.66.7: The bulls continue in this vs., but at least they have a little more to do.

X.66.8: The hapax root noun cmpd. *yajña-niṣkṛ́t-* is unusual in apparently cmpding a root noun both with a nominal and with a preverb; this type (NOMINAL–PREVERB √ROOT) is rare to non-existent. See Scar (649 and n. 921) and my 2020 *iṣudhyá-* (Fs. Lamberterie): 486–87, as well as my 2024 Fs. Kellens art. "Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian." In fact, the next phrase, *adhvarā́ṇām abhiśrī́-*, may illustrate the point (see below). As for this cmpd., see Scar (78–79), who suggests that it results from confusion between synonymous *níṣ* √*kṛ* and *iṣ* √*kṛ*, the latter an idiom with a synchronically unanalyzable pseudo-preverb. He even suggests an underlying form **yajñam-iṣkṛ́t-*, with an accusative, which was reanalyzed as *yajña-niṣkṛ́t-*. Although this last suggestion seems fanciful (or desperate), a confusion between the two idioms may have led to the creation of this anomalous form. (See disc. in the Kellens Fs art., p. 142.)

The cmpd *abhiśríyaḥ* is of course plural, but "full glories" does not go well in English; *adhvarā́ṇām* is also plural, despite the singular rendering in the publ. tr. (a lapse). For this phrase GEN *abhiśrī́-* I long favored substituting "excelling in glory over the ceremonies," parallel to VI.70.1 *bhúvanānām abhiśríyā* "excelling in glory over the creatures." However, I would now tr. it as "perfector of the ceremonies"; see disc. ad I.44.3, VIII.44.7. The root noun *abhiśrī́-* is generally construed with a genitive, and the *abhi-* suggests the notion of superiority or dominance over. This interpr. differs somewhat from that given by Scar (547–48) and the lit. cited there. It is striking that, beside our phrase *adhvarā́ṇām abhiśrī́-* (here and VIII.44.7), there exists a cmpd *adhvara-śrī́-* (5x). Scar (545–46) is hard pressed to account for the construction and interpr. of the cmpd, but I wonder if it represents an underlying **adhvara–abhi-śrī́-*, with

both nominal and preverb. The cmpd. has expelled the preverb because root noun cmpds can have only two members (see immed. above, on *yajña-niṣkṛ́t-*). This would be exactly parallel to the expulsion I hypothesize in an original **iṣu-prati-dhā/dh-* 'arrow-aiming', resulting in **iṣu-dh-*, in my 2020 article cited above. The full phrase *adhvará-+abhi-śrī-* would be preserved with the gen. pl. of the nominal and the preverb+root noun, as here. Alternatively when the root noun was construed with the preverb, the nominal member got bumped. See the comm. cited above.

X.66.9: The injunctive *janayan* is one of only two 3rd pl. active injunctives to this stem, where we expect instead the likewise transitive *janayanta* with *-anta* replacment. The other is in nearby X.61.7; see disc. there and my 1979 *-anta* replacement article (IIJ 21), esp. p. 154.

The phrase *abhí vratā́* is difficult to parse. Most tr. take it as a separate prep. phrase, loosely construed: So Ge "für die heiligen Werke," Re "selon les voeux (divins)" (commenting that the phrase "resolves" a cmpd. **abhivratam* [no accent given]), HPS (Vrata 63) "um der Gelübde willen." The publ. tr., "to their commandments," is of this type, though it might be easier to interpr. as "according to their commandments" or, with a looser gloss of *vratá-*, "to their standards." I think some version of this interpr. is probably correct, but it is possible that *vratā́* is simply another object to *janayan*; cf. VII.75.3 *janáyanto daívyāni vratā́ni*. This, however, would leave *abhí* stranded; it's difficult, though perhaps not impossible, to take it as a preverb in tmesis with *janayan*. For another problematic ex. of *abhí vratā́*, see VIII.32.28 and comm. thereon.

Note that *ā́paḥ* in b shows the occasional substitution of nom. pl. for acc. pl. in this stem. It is noteworthy here because in the previous vs. the last pāda begins with a correct acc. pl. *apáḥ* (X.66.8d); however, the c pāda of the next vs. (X.66.10c) begins exactly like our pāda, *ā́pa óṣadhīḥ*, where the nominative is correct. Cf. also other exx. of this pāda opening (V.41.11, VII.34.25 with expected nom. – though cf. also the acc. *apá óṣadhīḥ* in VI.39.5). It is possible that the redactors altered our phrase to match the nearly identical expression in the following verse; since sandhi across the pāda boundary would have amalgamated the final and initial vowels to *vratā́pa óṣadhīh*, the only change would have been the erasure of the accent on the putative acc. **apáḥ* (that is, **vratā́pá*).

In c the form *svàr* raises questions. Ge (n. 9c) simply pronounces it an honorary instr. and tr. "mit Sonnenlicht" (sim. HPS, Vrata 63). Re attenuates the sense but leaves the grammar intact, tr. "le ciel" as a second obj. to "fill." I am reluctant to tamper with either morphology or sense, though I'm not sure what filling the sun would actually mean. Kü (372) also takes this austere road.

The last part of d, *tanvī ní māmṛjuḥ*, is found identically in the companion hymn, X.65.7d. There the gods clasped to themselves the sacrifice they had just created; here the object is both more intangible and more comprehensive: their "will" (*váśa-*). I take this to mean that they have fully appropriated and deployed the motivation and ability to effect the actions described in the earlier parts of the vs.

X.66.10: With the gen. phrase *mahiṣásya tanyatóḥ* both Ge and Re supply a head noun 'master', modifying the dual dvandva *vātāparjanyā́*. This is certainly possible, but I think it is also possible that the relationship between Wind + Thunderstorm and thunder is meant to be more open-ended. Unfortunately the publ. tr., which reflects this idea, is hard to interpr.

X.66.11: The formation of *tanayitnú-* here differs from *tanyatú-* in the preceding vs. (10b) as well as in the preceding hymn (X.65.13), and I'm not sure what, if any, distinction is meant to be drawn. I tr. *tanyatú-* as "Thunder" and *tanayitnú-* as "Thundering," but this is simply to register the difference in formation. Note esp. that X.65.13 contains the sequence *tanyatúr ékapād ajáḥ*, which seems a minimal reverse reordering of our *ajá ékapāt tanayitnúḥ*—which might suggest that *tanyatú-* and *tanayitnú-* refer to the same entity. Since sorting out these minor divinities is difficult anyway, I won't speculate further.

In d we may have two different groups – the All Gods *and* my patrons – or the gods may be identified as my patrons, with patrons an appositive. The position of *utá* could be compatible with either reading, conjoining all of d with the list in abc or conjoining the two terms of d. The standard interpr. (Ge, Re; also JSK, DGRV I.335) opt for the former, but it's worth noting (as Ge does, n. 11d) that the gods were identified as patrons (same word *sūráyaḥ*) and creators of the sacrifice in vs. 2, and so the second possibility is a strong one.

X.66.12: Ge/Re take *mánavaḥ* as 'humans' and as modifying the 1st pl. subject of *syā́ma* ("may we humans be ..."). The publ. tr. "might we be Manu-s," with the more specific interpr. of the stem *mánu-*, which then is predicated of the subject, comes from a suggestion of JPB. The idea is that we all want to enact the role of Manu as first sacrificer at the first instantiation of the sacrifice, which would then be a joint venture between Manu (/us Manu-s) and the gods, who, as we saw in 2d (and X.65.7d), begot the sacrifice. In b it is surely the gods who are urged to lead the sacrifice east. Re cites Bergaigne as having an interpr. similar to the publ. tr. ("puissions-nous être à vos yeux des Manus ...").

X.66.13: The divine model for the current sacrifice is further set forth here.

See extensive disc. of *prátiveśa-* (only here in the RV, but common later) and related words ad X.49.5. The literal gloss in AiG II.1.284, 'die Wohnung gegenüber habend', and its suggested meaning 'neighbor' seem reasonable.

X.66.14: This vs. makes a strong claim on the part of the poet(s) to belong to the poetic lineage of Vasiṣṭha, who is surely the referent of *pitṛvát* 'like/in the manner of (their) father'. I think it quite likely that the seer embedded in *ṛṣivát* 'like/in the manner of the [/a] seer' is also Vasiṣṭha, rather than a generic figure.

The close partnership between us humans and the gods in the sacrificial enterprise is also depicted here, where the gods are referred to as prized and pleased 'kinsmen' (*jñātáyaḥ*).

X.66.15: This vs., identical to the final vs. of X.65, also asserts the Vasiṣṭha connection.

X.67–68 Bṛhaspati

Two hymns dedicated to Bṛhaspati. In addition to the usual treatments, see HPS's detailed discussions in B+I; Re treats the Bṛhaspati hymns in ÉVP XV. On the supposed poet Ayāsya see comm. ad X.67.1.

X.67 Bṛhaspati

Laura Massetti compares the structure and themes in this hymn with Pindar's Pythian 12 (see her 2024 *Pindar's* Pythian Twelve, Part II, esp. pp. 102–18).

X.67.1: The first word of the hymn, *imā́m*, is a near-deictic "this ... here" and implicitly locates us on the ritual ground, with this hymn (*dhī́-* 'insightful thought') being recited now. In this particular case, the speaker credits "our father" (*pitā́ naḥ*), by implication Bṛhaspati, with finding (that is, composing) the hymn, with an augmented imperfect *avindat*. This is unlike the usual RVic situation, in which the poet claims to be himself composing the hymn, though "in the manner" of a father or ancestor – e.g., in the immediately preceding hymn, X.66.14 *vásiṣṭhāsaḥ pitṛvád vā́cam akrata* "like their father(s) the Vasiṣṭhas have made speech"; instead it seems to depict something closer to the later śrauta ritual situation in which already existing ritual texts are recited in a fixed liturgy.

On the various possible referents of "seven-headed" (*saptáśīrṣṇīm*) see Ge (n. 1a), HPS (228), and now Massetti (2024: 108, 180, and *passim*).

The adj. *bṛhatī́m* 'lofty' evokes the dedicand's name, Bṛha(spa)ti; we might also see the anagram in *pitā́* (←) *-páti-*.

The "fourth one" (*turī́yam*) in c cannot be directly coreferential with *imā́m dhíyam* in pāda a because of the gender difference. It could, however, match *ukthám* in d. As noted in the publ. intro., it is strongly reminiscent of the fourth part of speech or the fourth formulation often prominent in Vedic discussions of the nature and powers of speech. Indeed, HPS takes it as the fourth formulation (*bráhman-*)(224).

The adj. *ayā́sya-* 'irrepressible' is used of various gods (Indra, Soma) and surely here refers to "our father," that is, Bṛhaspati, as HPS (227–28) argues. The Anukramaṇī has probably extracted it from this first vs. as the name of the poet, to whom not only these two hymns (X.67–68) but also IX.44–46 are attributed, and who becomes an independent figure in the later tradition. On the reinterpretation of the adjective as a PN, see HPS (165–66, 227–28), citing Pischel; Mayr (PN s.v.); and comm. ad I.62.7; and for Ayāsya's later existence, see Macdonell-Keith, Vedic Index s.v.

X.67.2: This vs. is lexically chained to vs. 1 (see HPS 228): 1d *śáṃsan*: 2a *śáṃsantaḥ* (both pres. participles, in adjacent pādas); 1a *dhíyam*: 2a *dī́dhyānāḥ*; 1b *ṛta*(*-prajātām*): 2a *ṛtám*; note also *pitā́* (1a) contrasted with *putrā́saḥ* (2b). This chaining superimposes the pl. Aṅgirases (vs. 2) on the sg. Bṛhaspati (vs. 1) as the original joint devisers of the verbal portion of the primal sacrifice. The important connection between *dhī́-* (1a) and *dī́dhyāna-* (2a) is not signaled in the publ. tr. due to the difficulty of coming up with a non-awkward English verb. Perhaps "seeing insights straightaway" in 2a.

The agreement of the participles *śáṃsan* and *śáṃsantaḥ* also suggests that their objects, *ukthám* (1d) and *ṛtám* (2a), can be superimposed and identified with each other (see Lü 421, Re comm. ad loc.). There is also verse-internal lexical and morphological play: the pres. mid. participles ending pādas a and c, *dī́dhyānāḥ* and *dádhānāḥ*, share not only a suffix and ending (*-ānāḥ*), but also a reduplicative skeleton*, d_dh*. And *dhā́ma* in d picks up *dádhāṇaḥ* in c.

The meaning and referent of *vípram padám* are disputed, as instances of *padá-* often are. Ge takes the phrase as a double acc., with *padám* predicated of *vípram* and meaning 'track': "den Redekundigen zu ihrer Wegspur machend"; he explains (n. 2c) that they follow in their speech the tracks/traces of Bṛhaspati. But most interpr. take *vípram* as a modifier of *padám*, meaning "inspired word/speech." See Lü (522 n. 6), Re (ad loc.), HPS (225). I do not see why it cannot be a pun, as the publ. tr. presents it (though perhaps it should be better phrased in the manner of Ge: "laying their inspired word as their track," in this case the track of the ritual cursus).

Most interpr. take *mananta* to mean "they thought up / devised" the *dhā́ma* of the sacrifice: Ge "haben ... ersonnen," HPS (225) "haben ... erdacht," Re "ont inventé." Certainly the *prathamám* 'first' qualifying *dhā́ma* supports this view. However, the occurrence of the VP *dhā́ma mána-* in X.97.1 *mánai ... dhā́ma*," where it refers to the various forms of plants, favors a more neutral "think about / bring to mind," with no sense of creation or invention. Hence my "pondered" – though I do not entirely reject the standard view.

X.67.3–8: The narration of the Vala myth begins here and continues through vs. 8. As noted in the publ. intro., the pattern associated with the name Bṛhaspati in this sequence is significant. The name first appears in vs. 3 at the beginning of pāda c, and this nom. *bṛ́haspátiḥ* occupies the same position in 4c and 5c, as well as 8c, with acc. *bṛ́haspátim* beginning 9c and 10c after the recital of the myth proper. Bṛhaspati's variant *bráhmaṇaspátiḥ* opens the c pāda of 7. But in the center of this sequence, vs. 6, we find instead *índraḥ* at the beginning of the vs., a vs. with no occurrence of Bṛhaspati – structurally imposing, as I suggest in the publ. intro., the superimposition and identification of Bṛhaspati and Indra.

The preverb *ví* figures prominently in this account (3b, 4d, 6b, 7b, 7d).

X.67.3: This vs. is esp. focused on the soundscape of the myth. On the one hand, the two intensive participles, *vā́vadadbhiḥ* (a) and *abhikánikradat* (c), both of sounds associated with animals, convey a sense of the constant cacophony in the background of the mythic actions: the Aṅgirases' constant vocalizations compared to the disordered honking of geese, Bṛhaspati's continual roaring at the cows like a bovine himself. On the other hand, the final pāda depicts the ritually regulated starting up of the praise song and its hymn tune, the province of the priestly figures the Prastotar and the Udgātar, an oasis of sonic order in the midst of an uproar of voices.

The presence of both *utá* and *ca* in pāda d is curious, esp. since they seem to form a "both ... and" structure, conjoining the two verbs *prā́staut* and *úd ... agāyat*. This kind of subclausal usage is rare with *utá*, as is the mixed construction with *ca*. See JSK (DGRV I.357) for disc. Of course, in pāda-initial position *ca* could not be used, but there doesn't seem any reason why *prá astaut* could not have been separated through tmesis by *ca* (* #*prá cāstaut ...*), like *úc ca ... agāyat*. Because these finite verb forms are preceded only by participles (*vyásyan ... abhikánikradat*) modifying the subject, we cannot interpr. the *utá* as a clause connector.

X.67.4: The three feminine entities, divided into two and one in pāda a, but aggregated as three in d, are universally interpreted as "doors" (for which I substituted "gates" as slight more suitable to a cave). As Ge points out (n. 4d), the 'doors' (*dúras*) are found in this Vala context in VI.18.5 and X.120.8. Re cleverly suggests that there may have been a (notional) haplology from the sequence *dvā́(bhyām) *dvā́rbhyām* that resulted in the gapping of the 'door' word here.

Note the echo of the first word of the vs., *aváḥ* (/*avó*) 'below', and the last, *ā́vaḥ* 'opened up' (underlying *āvar*) -- a very compressed ring.

X.67.5: Here we meet another "three," but neut. (*trī́ṇi*), not the fem. of 4d (*tisráḥ*).

Pāda a contains the problematic *śayáthem* (Pp *śayáthā īm*), which has received a variety of interpr., none of them satisfactory. The publ. tr. follows Old (as does Re) in taking *śayáthā* as a neut. acc. pl. (Old "Lagerstätten," publ. tr. "lairs") as parallel obj. beside *purám*. The stem is otherwise only found in two passages in adjacent hymns, dat. *śayáthāya* (VI.18.8) and loc. *śayáthe* (VI.17.9). Both those forms appear to have (quasi-)infinitival value 'to lie', although

only the dative fits this function well morphologically (see comm. ad VI.17.9). Gr suggests we should read *śayáthe* here as well (with no explan. of the *-m*); Ge (n. 5a) reads *śayáthā* (with the Pp, the likely analysis), but claims that the form is an infinitive (with no explan. of the morphology). HPS (B+I 225–26) takes it as an instr. (flg. a corrrection by Thieme [IIJ 3.15] of HPS's tr. in Vrata 47 n. 84), attributing the sense 'riverbed' to the stem: "Nachdem er den zurückgebeugten Wall durch ein Flussbett zerspalten hatte." I have no idea what this is meant to mean; how can a fortress be split by a riverbed, and how did Bṛhaspati get hold of such an instrument in the first place? In his tr. in Vrata, *śayátha-* is also 'riverbed', but (I think) as an acc. pl., expressing what parts the fortress separated into after Bṛhaspati split it ("Die ... Burg ... zerspaltete er in (Fluss-)betten"), which are then the referents of the "three" in pāda b; this interpr. basically follows Ge's alternative, given in his n. 5a. Given that that the various tricky manipulations of morphology or meaning don't yield plausible sense, Old's acc. pl. seems the simplest and the least harmful. But I am still disturbed by several features. First, at least in my interpr. the fem. sg. *ápacīm* modifies *púram*, but is separated from it by *śayáthem*. However, this word order might be iconic for splitting *apart* the fortress. More serious is the position of the particle *īm* (assuming that's what's lurking in *śayáth**em***). In my treatment of this particle ("Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm*," Fs. Cardona 2002) I point out (pp. 303–4 and n. 23) that *īm* is almost always found either in second, or modified second, position (as in 7a) or directly before the verb. Of the 208 instances of *īm* (per Lubotsky), only nine fail to conform – including this one. After reconsidering the problems posed by *śayáthem* I now find I cannot accept the neut. acc. pl. + *īm* interpr. found in the publ. tr. The need to posit an out-of-place *īm* seems close to fatal, esp. because the acc. pl. 'lairs' doesn't fit the passage all that well, and further the other two occurrences of the stem *śayátha-* are in (quasi-)verbal usage, not concrete. I now find myself sympathetic to Gr's suggestion that we read **śayáthe*. This entails assuming that the *-m* was originally a hiatus breaker (notionally *-m̐*) that was reinterpreted as a real *m* – even though (and this is a major problem) this is not a sequence (*-*e a*-) where a hiatus-breaking *-m̐* would be introduced. If this dubious analysis is accepted, *śayáthe* would have the same quasi-infinitival use as in VI.17.9 and depict the collapse of the *púr-* and its subsequent position. I would now tr. "Having split apart the stronghold to lie facing backwards," eliminating "(from front) to back, (having split apart) the lairs" and picking up with "at one blow." The use of a form of 'lie' would thematically connect this account of the Vala myth with the Vṛtra myth, where √*śi* is a signature word (see esp. I.32).

The next problem is the identity of the three (neut. *trī́ṇi*) in pāda b, which in part depends on the sense of the lexeme *níṣ* √*kṛt*. In its only other RVic occurrence, in IX.108.6, the object is something desirable (cows) that one cuts out from its surroundings (=stone) (... *áśmano nír gā́ ákṛṇtat*), i.e., essentially the same context as here. Our *níṣ* √*kṛt* seems parallel also to *niṣ* √*bhṛ* in a similar context in the next, paired hymn (X.68.8). With Ge (n. 5b) (and Sāy., sim. Re) I identify the three as the dawn, the sun, and the cow found in pāda c (*uṣásaṃ sū́ryaṃ gā́m*), despite the gender mismatch between neut. *trī́ṇi* and the assorted fem. and masc. items in c; the neut. may be a cover term for "three (things)," esp. since neither masc. nor fem. would encompass all three. (Re supplies "trésors" with *trī́ṇi*.) Although together pādas cd name four things (including *arkám*), this last term is in a separate pāda and, as Ge points out (n. 5b), Bṛhaspati had already found it (see 1ab *dhíyam ... avindat*). Moreover, in the parallel in the next hymn, X.68.9, the verb 'find' (*avindat*) has three objects, and though *arká-* also occurs in that vs., in a separate pāda as here, it is in the instr., not the acc. of the other three.

"Water-holder, reservoir" (*udadhí-*) is a slightly odd way to refer to the Vala cave, but it can hardly have any other referent. The usage is similar to that of "well" in English, which can be used metaphorically as a container for substances other than water (e.g., "well of loneliness"); in fact, we also have metaphorical expressions with this very word – e.g., "reservoir of goodwill," "reservoir of infection" (apparently a technical term in epidemiology), etc.

X.67.6: On the significance of the vs.-initial placement of *índraḥ* here, see comm. above ad vss. 3–8 and the publ. intro. Not only is Indra superimposed on Bṛhaspati here, but he has access to the same verb: (*ví*) *cakarta*, like Bṛhaspati's (*níḥ ...*) *akṛntat* in 5b, while the preverb *ví* in *ví cakartā* echoes Bṛhaspati's *vibhídya* in 5a.

As noted in the publ. intro. *rakṣitár-* 'guard' is an ambiguous and potentially menacing term. See Re's comm.

Gr, Ge, and HPS (226) render *kará-* as 'hand', a sense well established in the epics and later, but, as Re points out, this would likely be the only example in Vedic. (The other RVic occurrence of the stem, in I.116.13, refers to the Aśvins. Ge and the publ. tr. [JPB] take it as 'hand' there, but a more generic 'doer' seems more likely; see comm. ad loc. The occurrence in AVŚ XII.2.2 likewise fits its context better with such a sense.) A meaning 'hand' here would seem distinctly odd, since the action of 'cutting apart' (*ví √kṛt*) is not something a hand by itself can manage (outside of Kung Fu movies) – better a physical 'doer', concretized as 'tool' or, with Re, "un instrument (à découper)" like a knife.

On sweat as a sign of ritual activity, see my 2015 "Avestan *xšuuīd*." A more literal tr. of this bahuvr. would be 'whose ointment/unguent is sweat'. The theme returns in the next vs., 7d.

X.67.7: Note the allit. in *sá ... satyébhiḥ sákhibhiḥ śucádbhiḥ* (also unified by instr. pl. ending) and *(gó)dhāyasam ... dhanasaír (a)dardaḥ*.

The cmpd *gó-dhāyas-* 'cow-nurturing' is presumably meant ironically, continuing the ambiguity of *rakṣitā́raṃ dúghānām*. It has an Old Avestan cognate *gaodāiiah-* (Y 29.2). Perhaps it is not an accident that the Avestan occurrence is in the famous Lament of the Soul of the Cow, when the Cow is complaining that the cow-tending is not entirely satisfactory. The Aves. correspondent supports a rendering 'nurturing cows', 'having the nurturing of cows' (so Gr). However, most tr. interpr. *gó-* not as an obj. of the 2nd member, but rather as the source of nourishment – Ge "der von den Rindern sich nährte"; Re. "qui tétait [le lait] des vaches"; HPS "dessen Nahrung die Kühe sind." I assume that all these interpr. are trying to capture the fact that the Vala cave is a sinister, not a nurturing figure towards the captive cows. But this seems to me sufficiently covered by an ironic interpr. of the cmpd. (like *gópati-* in the next vs.). Against the "source" interpr. is the fact that several of the host of X-*dhāyas-* cmpds – *arí-dhāyas-*, *kārú-dhāyas-*, *bhū́ri-dhāyas-* -- clearly have 1st member objects ('nourishing the stranger', etc.). *viśvá-dhāyas-* is ambiguous: either 'nourishing all' (with obj.) or 'having all nourishments', but it certainly doesn't mean *'deriving nourishment from all'; by my interpr. *hári-dhāyas-* means 'having golden nourishment', not 'nourishing the golden', but again certainly not *'deriving nourishment from the golden' (see comm. ad III.44.3).

The root-noun cmpd *dhana-sā́-* is found 6x in the RV, including in nearby X.65.10; *dhana-sá-* here is a nonce thematization. See Scar 581.

The *gharmá-* in *gharmá-sveda-* may well refer to the gharma pot at the Pravargya ritual; cf., in the frog hymn, VII.103.8 *adhvaryávo gharmíṇaḥ siṣvidānā́ḥ* and comm. thereon.

For the sense of *ví √naś* here, see comm. ad X.64.15.

X.67.8: *iyāná-* 'begging' may be used sarcastically here. They used verbal means, which is like begging, but the words in fact 'compelled'.

iṣanayanta – This hapax, which belongs in the hazy group of *iṣaṇa-*, *iṣaṇya-* and the nominals *iṣáṇi-* and *iṣaṇyā́-*, is rendered by Re and HPS as intrans./reflex. But it is surely an *-anta* replacement and so is transitive, as Ge (and I) take it.

mithó-avadya-pa- is one of the few three-member cmpds in the RV; I have found fewer than 20 (not counting negated two-member cmpds, cmpds with *su-* and *dus-*, and cmpds. with a lexicalized member [like *gopa-*]). See my forthcoming "Limits on Indo-Iranian Compounding" (Ged. G. Holland). This rarity adds to the difficulty of interpreting it. It seems to have been rather casually assembled. The final member *-pa-* is, like *-sa-* in 7 above, thematized from the root noun *-pā-* 'protect' (see Scar 308). For *avadya-pa-*, Renou cites the syntagm I.185.10 *pātā́m avadyā́t*. To this "protecting from fault," the adverb *mitháḥ* 'alternately, mutually' would be loosely joined. If 'protecting each other from fault' (e.g., Old "einander wechselseitig als Abwehrer von Schande habend") vel sim. is really the sense of the cmpd., its application to the Aṅgirases is somewhat puzzling. But there is an alternative. In my copy of HPS's B+I, which belonged to Stanley Insler, he penciled in the margin "protecting from falsity and disgrace = dvandva." This seems eminently worth considering, esp. if *mitháḥ* here has a sense closer to that found in Iranian, where it refers to wrong or falsehood. For the Old Persian evidence see R. Schmitt, *Wörterbuch der altpersischen Königsinschriften*, p. 215 with lit. In Avestan the adverb is esp. associated with false speech: Old Avestan *miϑah-uuacah-* 'having false speech', YA *miϑaoxta-* 'falsely spoken', *miϑō.aog-* 'falsely speaking'. Here it would be paired with *avadya-*, whose literal meaning is of course 'not to be spoken'. I now suggest an alternate interpr., based on Insler's dvandva analysis: "protecting from the false and the unspeakable" – an appropriate description of the Aṅgirases, whose realm is true and effective speech. Alternatively, it is possible that we are dealing with two words here, with *mitháḥ* a separate adverb (as in the next hymn, X.68.10, where it means 'alternately') and a standard two-member cmpd. that should be accented **avadya-pébhiḥ* (cf. *dhana-saíḥ* in 7b), with the accent having been erased redactionally. The problem then would be: what does *mitháḥ* mean in that context? It seems unlikely that Bṛhaspati and the Aṅgirases alternated in releasing the cows or did so rivalrously. I therefore prefer the dvandva analysis.

úd usriyā́ asṛjata reprises 4d *úd usrā́ ā́kar.*

X.67.9–10: These two verses continue the practice of positioning Bṛhaspati at the beginning of the hemistich, as in 3c, 4c, 5c, 8c (and with variant 7c), but in the accusative, not the nominative -- thus marking a boundary between the Vala narrative and the present-day ritual situation. In both the verses he is modified by immediately following *vṛ́ṣaṇam* 'bull, bullish'. Since Indra is overwhelmingly the referent of this word, the sequence *bṛ́haspátiṃ vṛ́ṣaṇaṃ* continues the superimposition and identification of the two gods that the deployment of their names in the Vala narrative set in motion.

X.67.9: This is the transition vs. back to the present time and the 1st ps. poets – but we don't find that out till the 1st pl. *madema* in d. Till then the subject could be the Aṅgirases.

Note that Bṛhaspati here is credited with martial, more-Indra-like skills.

X.67.10: With Old, I attach ab to the previous vs. because it seems to continue the victory narrative from there, but this is not necessary. The second hemistich lacks a finite verb; I supply *ánu madema* from 9d.

Pāda c is a mash-up of 9a *vardháyantaḥ* and 9c *bṛ́haspátiṃ vṛ́ṣaṇam*.

My interpr. of d differs from the standard ones, and infuses it with more content – perhaps going beyond the evidence. It is dependent on the interpr. of *nā́nā*. Ge (n. 10c) follows Sāy. (*nānā dikṣu santaḥ*) in taking it locationally ("da und dort weilend"), while Re seems to project this onto conceptual social location ("bien qu'étant diversement (situés sur le plan social)"). I suggest that the *nā́nā* refers to the varying capacities of the poets, who each "bring light with their mouth" (*bíbhrato jyótir āsā́*), but in different ways according to their particular verbal skills.

X.67.11: On the formation of the infinitival *vayodhaí* (also X.55.1), see Scar 261.

X.67.12: The intrusion of the Vṛtra myth (pāda c) and other violent Indraic exploits is surprising in this insistently Bṛhaspati/Vala-oriented hymn. The vs. seems tacked on; on the other hand, the invocation of Heaven and Earth duplicates that of the two world halves in 11d. More to the point, there is some ring composition: *saptá* in 1a and 12c, *mūrdhán-* in 12b recalling *śīrṣan-* in 1a.

X.68 Bṛhaspati

On the complex style of this hymn see publ. intro.

Like X.67, this hymn has its share of verse-, hemistich-, and pāda-initial occurrences of *bṛ́haspáti-*: 1d, 2d, 3c, 4c, 5c, 6b, 7a, 8d, 9c, 10b, 11d, 12c. There is one, and only one, per verse. As discussed below ad vs. 7, it is likely that all these occurrences are extra-clausal and topicalized.

X.68.1: This vs. has three marked similes (pādas a, b, c), each of which presents difficulties of interpretation. In all three cases the comparandum is the chants (*arká-*) directed towards Bṛhaspati in d.

In the first simile the point of comparison is noisy water birds "constantly gabbling" (the intens. part. *vā́vadataḥ*; see in the previous hymn X.67.3 where the Aṅgirases are modified by the same participle). There is some unhappiness among interpreters about the other participle in this simile, *rákṣamāṇa-*. Gr suggests reading *yákṣamāṇa-* ('appearing, displaying'?); Old favors Brunnhofer's suggestion *krákṣamāṇa-* 'howling' (vel sim.), which is associated with *udaprút-* in IX.108.7. However, as Ge points out (n. 1ab), this would involve adjusting the sandhi of transmitted *váyo*. And I for one see no semantic problem with *rákṣamāṇa-*. Flocks of birds on water are often found in fairly tight, noisy groups, which can be seen as (and probably are) mutually protective. I take the middle participle as reciprocal; Re interpr. it as passive ("qu'on tenait enfermés"), but the middle of √*rakṣ* is never passive.

Note that the part. *vā́vadataḥ* occurs across the pāda boundary from the birds and sits exactly between the first and second similes. This allows it to be construed with both, as, e.g., HPS (218) sees. With the first it is a nom. pl. masc., with the second it is the homonymous gen. sg., modifying *abhríyasya*: "of the ever-speaking (lit.) X of the cloud." Although most interpr. *abhríya-* as the cloud itself, I prefer to see it as the adj. it is formally, modifying a gapped "thunder."

The difficulty of c lies in the hapax *giribhráj-*, and within this cmpd there are several problems: 1) what is the second member? and 2) what is the relation of the first member to the second? For a detailed disc. see Scar (373–74). A number of possibilities have been suggested for the etymology of *-bhráj-*, of which the strongest competitors are **bhleg^{u}* 'swell' (also possibly in the root noun *bhráj-* AVŚ VII.90.2, possibly meaning 'penis') and **bhreg* 'break' (for a recently suggested alternative root see below). The 'break' interpr. is the one favored by most tr. and comm.: Gr, Ge, Re, HPS (218), Mau (155) [Pokorny IEW also includes it there] and generally involves a direct-object function for the 1st member, or at least a goal, though an ablatival source is also sometimes considered: e.g., Re "brisant la montagne" (direct obj.) versus Mau "as they break upon the rocks" (goal) versus Gr (alt. gloss; sim. Re's alt. in n.) "aus ihnen [=mountains] hervorbrechend" (source). For "waves" in a similar direct object context, see VI.61.2 *iyám ... arujat, sā́nu girīṇā́ṃ taviṣébhir ūrmíbhiḥ* "She [=the river Sarasvatī] broke the back of the mountains with her powerful waves." The problem is that there are no other certain (and few if any possible) traces of **bhreg* in Indo-Aryan. Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *bhráj-*) considers it "willkürlich" to involve the 'break' root here.

The 'swell, be erect' interpr. has the merit of an at least tenuous connection with another Vedic word, the aforementioned root noun *bhráj-* 'penis'(?). The publ. tr. follows this interpr. and the exact wording, "stiff-peaked (like) mountains," was adapted from a suggestion of Darms, reproduced in EWA ("Steifheit wie Berge habend"). Scar also favors 'swell', but points out that *giri-* as first compound member often has a locatival sense (e.g., *giri-kṣít-* 'dwelling in the mountains'; Scar's suggested gloss, 'im Gebirge schwellend," is more plausible, if less poetic, than the one based on Darms.

Recently (WeCIEC 28, 2016; Proceedings publ. 2018: 79–81), R. Ginevra suggested a different interp. of both parts of the cmpd and a diff. meaning for the whole. He glosses it "loud-roaring." The 2nd member belongs to a root **bhṛ(h$_2$)g* 'roar', of his manufacture, whose nearest Vedic relative is, by his account, *bhūrjáyant-* in X.46.4 – but see comm. ad loc.: it is not at all clear that this stem even exists. As for the first member, he takes it as a reduced form of **g^{u}erh$_2$* 'heavy'. This is of course a particularly bold interpr., since 'heavy' has *u*-vocalism in Skt. (*gur-ú-*); Ginevra has a complex and ultimately unconvincing way to get to *giri-*, but the real problem is that it's hard to imagine a **giri-* 'heavy' surviving the competition not only of the well-attested *girí-* 'mountain', but the even better attested *gír-* 'song'. That a cmpd 'loud-roaring' would have survived with that meaning in Vedic when neither of its members has any support in the attested language, beggars belief.

But Ginevra's alternative interpr. has the merit of reminding us that the cmpd. should somehow fit the simile in which it's embedded, and that simile concerns noise. Wave(s) are at least marginally associated with sound elsewhere in the RV: see I.44.12 *síndhor iva prásvanitāsa ūrmáyaḥ* "like the clamorous waves of a river"; IX.50.1 *síndhor ūrmér iva svanáḥ* "like the roar of the wave of a river." Although the cmpd *giribhráj-* does not have to contribute semantically to the simile, on the other hand, deploying a hapax cmpd that is irrelevant to the content of the passage seems an unlikely move on the part of a skilled RVic poet. Assuming that it does contribute to the noise simile, I now think that "breaking the mountains" is more compatible with the simile than "stiff-peaked (like) mountains," since breaking or pounding the rocks is going to produce a certain amount of noise. At least as an alternative, I would therefore now change the publ. tr. to "breaking the mountains" (see VI.61.2 cited above), despite the problematic absence of other reflexes of **bhreg*.

The collocation of *ūrmí-* and √*mad* 'be/make exhilarated' found here (*ūrmáyo mádantaḥ*) is also found elsewhere: VI.44.20, VIII.14.10, passages laconically cited by Ge (n. 1c; see also HPS). The association presumably arose because *ūrmí-* is often used metaphorically of "wave(s)" of soma, whose signature verb is √*mad*.

I have no explanation of the lengthened root vowel in the isolated form *anāvan* beside the standard thematic stem *náva-*, beyond the standard invocation of metrical necessity (see, e.g., Gr), always a weak argument. The form deviates from the rest of its present also in being active, against the middle voice of all but a single participle *návantam* (VI.17.10). The active voice may imitate the act. intensive *ānónavīti* (12b), with which it forms a ring (see comm. ad loc.), but this does not help with the root vocalism.

X.68.2: On the interrelated and developing similes in this vs., see the publ. intro. as well as Ge's n. 2ab.

The opening phrase *sáṃ góbhiḥ* participates in two different images in the first hemistich. The first, unrecognized by other tr./comm., is triggered by the end of the preceding vs., (*abhí ...*) *anāvan* "they bellowed." In the Aṅgiras context *góbhiḥ* can be associated with the root √*nu* 'bellow'. See, e.g., IV.3.11 *sám áṅgiraso navanta góbhiḥ* "The Aṅgirases roared along with the cows" (also V.45.8), with both *sám* and *góbhiḥ*. The joint bellowing refers to the mutual recognition-by-sound that allowed the Aṅgirases to free the cows penned up in the Vala cave. (Note also that Bṛhaspati roared at the cows in the previous hymn. [X.67.3], though with a different root: *bṛ́haspátir abhikánikradad gā́ḥ*.)

But *sáṃ góbhiḥ* √*nī* also exists independently; see V.42.4 *sám indra ṇo mánasā neṣi góbhiḥ* "Through your thought, Indra, lead us together with cows," and the final word of the hemistich, *ninā́ya*, is thus also to be construed with the opening. The object of the frame construction is gapped, but with Ge and Re (and HPS in n.) we can supply. the Aṅgirases, whom Bṛhaspati reunites with the (freed) cows. In the simile Bhaga leads Aryaman (*bhága ivéd aryamáṇam*); as I explained in the publ. intro. "Bhaga (Fortune or Good Fortune) leads Aryaman, the "civilizing" god of custom, one of whose roles is patron of marriage, to the marriage ceremony in order to preside." The ceremony itself is found in the next pāda. That the simile in b relates to the marriage is the view of Ge, Re, and Mau (156 n. 2), though HPS explicitly disavows this interpr. (219 n.).

In my opinion, the verse-initial *sáṃ góbhiḥ* that we've already used twice in the first hemistich gets reused in pāda c, as Ge also suggests (n. 2c, tentatively also Re n.). The simile, which dominates the pāda, is of the marriage ceremony, with the officiant (*jáne mitráḥ*) in the nom. "anointing" the married couple in the acc. (*dámpatī*). As Ge points out, this step in the ceremony is ordinarily expressed with the lexeme *sám* √*añj* (e.g., in the final vs. of the wedding hymn, X.85.47 *sám añjantu víśve devā́ḥ*; see also Ge's other citations). It is rather nice that *sám* 'together' <u>unites</u> the various pieces of this vs.

Two questions remain about the verse. First, who is the referent of *jáne mitráḥ*? second, how does the frame, which must be entirely supplied, match the simile? As for the first, most take the *mitrá-* to be an actual friend or close associate of the couple (so Ge, Re, Mau), while HPS, with a different arrangement of simile and frame, opts for Mitra. I think instead that it is Agni, who is elsewhere called *jáne mitráḥ* (II.4.1, VIII.23.8; for disc. see my "Rigvedic Svayaṃvara?" Fs. Parpola [2001]: 312). Agni officiates at the wedding by virtue of the centrality of the ritual fire at the marriage ceremony.

My answer to the second question is given in the publ. intro.: "Just as Agni anoints the marrying couple with milk, so Bṛhaspati "anoints" the Aṅgirases (compared to the couple) with cows." Alternatively, Ge and Re take the Aṅgirases and the cows as the two parties to the ceremony representing the dual *dámpatī* 'married couple'; this is also one of the possibilities that HPS entertains. This is possible, but it fails to make use of the instr. *góbhiḥ* as the anointing medium. And the image of the Aṅgirases and the cows pairing off in marriage might be a bit extreme.

Pāda d breaks this mood, with competition substituting for union. Again, the identity of the object in the frame, to which the swift horses are compared, is unspecified and somewhat unclear; I assume the Aṅgirases, who are spurred to action to open the cave. (This action is, of course, out of order, since the rest of the vs. assumes the cows have already been freed, but chronological scrambling is scarcely unknown in the RV.)

Another question about d: who is addressing Bṛhaspati? I assume that the abrupt departure from the topic of abc also returns us to the larger context of the hymn, and the poet is the speaker, but both Ge and Re take the address to be internal to the scenario of pāda c and spoken by the officiant (*jáne mitráḥ*). In this case it could not be urging the Aṅgirases to open the cave, since the cave is already open. *If* we interpret the impv. clause internally (which, as I said, I am not inclined to do), we might compare Agastya's address to his wife Lopāmudrā in I.179.3 *jáyāvéd átra śatánītham ājím* "let us two win here the contest of a hundred strategems," as a programmatic blueprint for marriage. It too contains the word *ājí-* 'contest'. However, I think this is farfetched.

X.68.3: The first hemistich consists entirely of fem. pl. adjs. with no referent specified until pāda d *gā́ḥ*, but of course the cows are in the discourse and were mentioned in the instr. in 2a.

There is no agreement on the sense or even the formation of the hapax cmpd *sādhv-aryā́ḥ*. Glosses range widely: Sāy. *sādhūnāṃ kalyāṇām payasāṃ netrīḥ*, Gr "gerade aus, vorwärts strebend," Old "bei denen die Arier ihr Ziel erreichen," Ge "die einem trefflichen Herrn gehören," Re "très amicales," Th (Fremdl. 87) "in guter Weise (schönstens) fremdenfreundlich (gastlich)," HPS "die gut gastlich sind," Mau "dear to the pious," JPB (Ādityas 162 n. 23) "correctly civilized." Several of these (notably Old and Ge) assume that the cmpd is a bahuvrīhi, but the accent is an obstacle. Old refers laconically to AiG I.2.296(d), treating bahuvrīhis with 2nd-member accent whose 1st member ends in *-i-* or *-u-*. But even if this rule worked better than it does, all of the cases listed there have 1st members with <u>light</u> initial syllables (*purú-*, etc.), and *sādhú-* decidedly does not (cf. also the bahuvrīhi *sādhú-karman-* X.81.7 with expected accent). Moreover, the simplex *aryá-* is an adjective and should not therefore be the head of a bahuvrīhi unless the adjective has been substantivized (as Ge's Herr and Old's die Arier implicitly assume). The publ. tr. follows JPB's interpr. of the adj. *aryá-* as 'civilized/civilizing' (discussed at length in Ādityas, 155–62), that is, "adhering to or upholding to (*sic*) the rites and customs of the Vedic peoples" (155), who are the others (*arí-*) who belong to the larger Ārya community (on which see comm. ad IX.79.3). The term is used here of cows in the context of hospitality (see immed. flg. *atithínīḥ* and Thieme, Fremdl. 86–87), a cardinal Ārya principle, but I do not think it necessarily has the narrow meaning "fremdenfreundlich" that Th gives it. It could simply emphasize the cows' status as domestic animals that ordinarily form part of the social group (see JPB's "they are domesticated and hence a part of the community," 162 n. 23) and have been reintegrated into it after their abduction and imprisonment outside of it. With Th I. take *sādhu-* as

adverbial here, rather than as referring to a group of particularly worthy people (e.g., Mau's "the pious").

The final word of pāda a, *iṣirā́ḥ*, makes a bad Triṣṭubh cadence. In fact, though the stem *iṣirá-* generally behaves well metrically when internal, often occurring right after the caesura where two light syllables are at home, there are several pāda-final occurrences like this one, making a bad Triṣṭubh cadence: in addition to this one, II.29.1, V.37.3, IX.96.15, X.98.3 (see also, in dimeter VIII.46.29). In all these cases a heavy second syllable (**iṣīrá-*) would be preferable, but precisely this shape would be anomalous in the post-caesura occurrences. I have no solution.

X.68.4: Judging from the 2nd hemistich, this vs. returns us to the moment of the opening of the Vala cave and the release of the cows. Bṛhaspati split open the enclosure ("the skin of the earth") so easily that his tool for splitting is compared to water in pāda d; see a similar characterization of the ease of this deed in the next vs., 5d. It is harder, though not impossible, to fit the first hemistich into this picture. I take ab as referring to the ritual preliminaries to the assault on the cave. The phrase *ṛtásya yóni-* is quite common in the RV, used for the ritual ground and esp. for the place where the ritual fire is installed (III.62.13, etc. etc.; see comm. ad X.65.7). The "honey" with which Bṛhaspati is sprinkling it may be milk or soma or even water. Despite Ge (n. 4a) and others (Mau, esp.) I don't think the liquid is rain, because Bṛhaspati isn't particularly associated with rain elsewhere.

Pāda b is the real problem, in part because of the ambiguous sandhi form *arká*. The Pp takes this as nom. sg. *arkáḥ,* and this is followed by most interpr. Before assessing that interpr., we should investigate what its referent might be. The stem *arká-* means both 'chant' and 'ray/flame'. Its proximity to *ulkā́-* 'firebrand' in this pāda has led a number of interpr. to favor the latter identification (e.g., Ge "Wetterstrahl"; also Re, Mau). However in a Bṛhaspati context the word should mean 'chant' – as it in fact does elsewhere in the hymn: 1d, 6b, 9b; see also in the previous hymn X.67.5. The chant is the means by which the Vala cave is opened. Old and HPS both recognize that *arká-* must mean 'chant' here; they both decide that Bṛhaspati is the personified *arká-* and therefore accept the nom. interpr. of the Pp. This is possible, but I prefer interpr. the sandhi form as loc. *arké*, as a minimal loc. absolute: "when the chant (was chanted)," referring to the moment when the cave is opened. That the chant can be secondarily associated with fire, and so the juxtaposition of *arká* and *ulkā́m* here is probably not accidental, is shown by 6b *agnitápobhir arkaíḥ* "with his fire-hot chants."

The problem that I can't solve is what is the object of *avakṣipán* in the frame, compared to the "firebrand of heaven" (*ulkā́m ... dyóḥ*) in the simile. In the publ. tr. I tentatively supply 'honey' from the first pāda, and in the absence of anything better I will stick with it – but it would depict a fairly aggressive sprinkling of the ritual ground, and I also don't see what it represents mythologically. Ge gets out of the problem by making the whole of b the simile (violating ordinary simile structuring principles by assuming a different verb in the simile from the frame, which for him is pāda a). Re, HPS, and Mau make the *iva* weakly adverbial ("pour ainsi dire," "gleichsam," "as it were"). This is tempting as an easy way to avoid the problem, but I am reluctant to do this because of the prominence of *iva* and the quite specific similes in this part of the hymn (3d, 4b, 4d, 5b, 5d).

X.68.5: The similes continue. In the first hemistich a four-element frame (gapped subject Bṛhaspati, object *támaḥ* 'darkness', instr. 'with light', abl. 'from the midspace') is more or less

matched by a three-elememt simile (subj. 'wind', object 'Śīpāla plant', abl. 'from the water'), with only the instr. missing: 'wind' can stand in for it as well.

The purport of the simile in the 2nd hemistich is not as clear – or rather, my interpr. differs from the general consensus. The standard interpr. is that the simile goes with the main verb: "brought the cows here like the wind a cloud." But to me this doesn't make sense: the wind doesn't bring clouds *here*; they stay in the midspace, wherever the wind pushes them. I think that the simile instead belongs with the gerund *anumṛśyā*. The lexeme *ánu* √*mṛś* occurs only here in the RV, and the tr. universally render it as 'lay hold of, seize' vel sim. — but √*mṛś* generally depicts a less aggressive action, 'touch, stroke, fondle'. In KS XXV.9 (116: 6) the causative *anumarśaya-* is used of healers touching a sick man, where 'seize' seems out of place. There is also a brief narrative in TS VI.1.3.6, where Indra seeks to prevent anyone else from being born from the womb from which he has just emerged. He *ánu* √*mṛś* the womb and splits it: *tásyā anumṛśya yónim ā́chinat*. Keith tr. 'stroking her womb he split it." Although "seizing" isn't ruled out here, the context invites a more intimate, if no less devastating, action. In our passage the object of *anumṛśyā* is generally taken to be "the cows of Vala," but esp. given the TS passage I think it better to supply 'skin' (*tvácam* from the immed. preceding vs. 4d) or even 'womb' (for the Vala cave as a womb, see IV.50.2; *yónim* is also found in the preceding vs., 4a, though with a different referent). Note that, like the womb in the TS passage, the "skin" was split in 4d (though with a different root), and Bṛhaspati splits something of Vala's in the next vs. (6ab) and, by my interpr., splits the *gárbha-* of the mountain in 7c. What does this have to do with the simile "like the wind a cloud"? I think the point is that the wind needs merely to "stroke" a cloud to move it, and this emphasizes how light and minimal a touch Bṛhaspati needed to open the Vala cave, a point also made in 4d.

With the simile of d associated with the gerund in c, the rest of d contains the main VP, whose meaning is straightforward: *ā́* √*kṛ* in the middle means 'bring here, make one's own'. What I don't understand is the doubling of *ā́*. Old (Noten ad I.3.7) says it's not uncommon and lists some passages, but I would still like an explanation. Perhaps the two *ā́*'s convey different senses: 'make one's own' and 'bring here'; this is what I meant to imply in the publ. tr.

X.68.6: The abstract noun *jásu-*'feebleness' may seem an odd object for the verb *bhed* 'split', which seems to call for a concrete object. However, it neatly summarizes the point of the similes in vss. 4 and 5, that Vala was easily breached. Ge unaccountably renders *jásu-* here by "das Gefängnis" (prison) without comment, though in its other occurrence (X.33.2) as "Verschmachten." Perhaps he was swayed by Sāy.'s concrete gloss *āyudham* 'weapon' in our passage.

On the pun that structures the 2nd hemistich see publ. intro. As discussed there, the pun is enabled by two ambiguous forms: *páriviṣṭam* and *ā́dat*. The former can be the ppl. to either √*viś* or √*viṣ*. In the former case, it means 'surrounded', in the latter 'served'. As for *ā́dat*, it can be the (re-marked medial) 3rd sg. root aor. to *ā́* √*dā* 'take' (*ā́* + (*a*)*da-t*) or a pseudo-thematic imperfect to the root pres. of √*ad* 'eat' (*a-ad-a-t*): the expected athematic form would have been **āt* (< **a-ad-t*), which cries out for remodeling. At least with regard to the publ. tr., only the former would be strictly correct, since the imperfect of √*ad*, without preverb, should not be accented in a main clause (see also Ge n. 6c). But secondary readings in puns can be lax about accentuation, and in any case nothing forbids c from being still in the domain of *yadā́* in pāda a, in which case both of the proposed verb forms would be accented in the subordinate cl. I therefore offer an alternative translation "When Bṛhaspati split the feebleness of taunting Vala with his fire-hot chants / (and)

he took / ate (the cows) ...," with the main clause represented only by d. Only Mau of the standard tr. takes this option.

As for the pun itself, taking *páriviṣṭa-* to √*viś* with the sense 'surrounded, trapped', the ppl. can be construed with the instr. *dadbhíḥ* as the agent/instrument; the more appropriate main verb would be *ā* √*dā* 'take' (though 'eat' is also possible). The image is the familiar and slightly unpleasant one of using the tongue to worry tiny particles of food stuck between the teeth and suggests that Bṛhaspati scoured all the nooks and crannies of the Vala cave for stray cattle. If *páriviṣṭa-* is taken to √*viṣ* in the lexeme 'serve', the more appropriate main verb would be 'eat' (though 'take' is not excluded), and the tongue and teeth together do the eating. HPS objects to Ge's supplying the cows as obj. of 'eat' because Bṛhaspati doesn't eat the cows – but supplying Vala as object, as he, Re, and Mau do, is subject to the same objection: Bṛhaspati doesn't eat the cave either. Surely "eat" is a metaphor and, in my opinion, works better with cows as object: Bṛhaspati sucks them all out of the cave at one time.

X.68.7: The position of *hí* is at first surprising, coming superficially in 3rd position: *bṛ́haspátir ámata hí* ..., but is easily explained if we take *bṛ́haspátiḥ* as extraclausal and topicalized, as I suggested above (intro. to hymn comm.) for all occurrences of the name in this hymn. Under this analysis *hí* would be in its standard 2nd position; see the same configuration in 12c *bṛ́haspátiḥ sá hí* ..., where the coreferential pronoun *sá* underlines the extraclausality of the immediately preceding name in the same case. Further, in 11d *bṛ́haspátir bhinát* ... it is easiest to explain the accent on the verb *bhinát* if it is actually first in its clause (same explanation for the repeated pāda in I.62.3) – the accent on *ámata* in our vs. can be ascribed to the presence of *hí*, though under the extraclausal analysis it would also be clause initial. Finally, in 1d the apparent second position of the preverb *abhí* in tmesis – *bṛ́haspátim* <u>*abhy*</u> *àrkā* <u>*anāvan*</u> makes better sense if it is notionally initial after extraclausal *bṛhaspátim*, since preverbs in tmesis ordinarily move to first position (though the position after the caesura, as here, is not infrequent). In the publ. tr. I did not mark off the occurrences of *bṛ́haspáti-* typographically (with dash or sim.) because I thought it would be distracting.

All the standard interpr. construe *sádane* with *gúhā yát* (e.g., Ge "der an de Orte verborgen war"). I do not, because *gúhā yát* is a pāda-final formulaic tag, at most preceded by *paramám*, which does not further participate in the clause to which it's attached beyond modifying a neuter noun earlier in its clause (*nā́ma* in this case). Interestingly the tag is only found in the RV in Maṇḍala X, though *gúhā* and *gúhya-* are common throughout. The occurrences: X.45.2, 61.13, 68.7, 85.16 (=AVŚ XIV.1.6) [*yád gúhā*], 181.2; AVŚ I.13.3, II.1.1, 2.

The simile in c has tied interpr. in knots, primarily because they want to make some bird or other the agent of *bhittvā́*, either the baby birds inside the eggs (Ge, HPS, Lu 522) or the mother bird (Re), all these birds being in fact invented. See Mau's useful n. on the passage, though his English deserts him in his own unparsable tr. In addition to the invented birds, some of these interpr. seem to assume that acc. *gárbham* is the agent of *bhittvā́* in the simile, which is syntactically impossible. As Ge says somewhat despairingly (n. 7cd), the simile "ist etwas schief geraten." The problem is that they all assume that *gárbham* in c must be part of the simile; the difficulty disappears if we take *gárbham* with the frame, with *párvatasya* in d dependent on it. *gárbham* is then the object of *bhittvā́*, parallel to *āṇḍā́* in the simile: "having split the *gárbha* of the mountain like the eggs of a bird." Although *gárbham* is somewhat more distant from its genitive than I would like, the phrase exists; see V.45.3 *párvatasya gárbhaḥ* adduced by Old and

see also Ge's n. 7d. And the "womb of the mountain" is a fine description of the Vala cave with the cows inside.

X.68.8: The simile in c is a bit slippery. From ab, where the cows are simply enclosed by the stone, we expect *níḥ ... jabhāra* in c to depict a simple removal. But the simile "like a cup from a tree" assumes the shaping and crafting of what was removed into an object of artifice: a cup, not just a block of wood.

X.68.9: Most of the first hemistich is a near variant of X.67.5cd in the immediately preceding hymn: *bṛ́haspátir uṣásaṃ sū́ryaṃ gā́m, arkám viveda ...* versus our *sóṣā́m avindat sá svàḥ só agníṃ, só arkéṇa ...* This close agreement is all the more surprising since there are very few verbal echoes between the two hymns, despite their kinship and shared subject matter. In our passage "fire" substitutes for "cow," as the third object of "find," but "cows" should be supplied as the obj. of *níḥ ... jabhāra* in the second hemistich.

The second simile with *níḥ ... jabhāra*, flg. directly on the one in 8c, is less daring, though still striking.

X.68.10: The simile in ab is neatly structured: both simile and frame are tripartite, with nom. subj. (woods / Vala), acc. object (leaves / cows), instr. agent of stealing (cold / Bṛhaspati). Connecting the subject and the object is the verb *akṛpayat* 'lamented', found overtly only in the frame but shared by simile and frame; connecting the object and the agent is the ppl. *muṣitā́* 'stolen', found overtly only in the simile but shared by simile and frame.

X.68.11: The first three pādas of this vs. seem at best loosely connected with the Bṛhaspati / Vala theme. Although, as Mau (n.) suggests, Bṛhaspati's freeing of the cows from Vala can be seen as an act of creation, with the Pitars joining in the cosmogonic fun, the specificity of the decorating of the night sky and the day sky seems different from the usual blaze of dawn after the opening of the cave. It seems possible that the alternate rising of sun and moon in 10d suggested this particular treatment.

The ornamenting of the dusky horse in pāda a is reminiscent of the Aśvamedha when the Wives of the king/sacrificer weave jewels into the hair of the horse just before it is sacrificed (see SW/SW 99–100 with reff.).

Pāda c is a perfect syntactic palindrome: LOC_1 ACC_1 VERB ACC_2 LOC_2, with the verb equally applicable to both VPs. Or, as Re says dismissively, "chiasme banal."

The last pāda, which is the final pāda of the hymn before the summary vs., briskly summarizes Bṛhaspati's accomplishment: "he split the rock; he found the cows," an abrupt and terse end to an elaborate hymn. For the accent on *bhinát* see comm. ad vs. 7 above and I.62.3, where the pāda is also found.

X.68.12: As indicated just above, this is clearly a summary vs. standing outside the hymn proper, whose content was just boiled down in the last pāda of the preceding vs. (11d). The near-deictic *idám* and the aorist *akarma* at the beginning of 12 locate the vs. in the ritual here-and-now, referring to the hymn, called an "(act of) reverence" (*námaḥ*), that was just recited.

The vs. also forms a ring with the first vs. of the hymn: the fairly rare word *abhríya-* 'belonging to a cloud' is found in both (1b, 12a), and the verb *ānónavīti* (12b) echoes two verbal forms in vs. 1: *anāvan* (1d) by root (√*nū*), *vā́vadataḥ* (1b) by morphology (both intensives), as

well, of course, as semantics. Interestingly, the referent of *abhríya-* / subject of *ānónavīti* in 12 is Bṛhaspati, but that is not the case in vs. 1.

Pāda b has only 10 syllables, and there is no obvious fix. HvN suggest a rest at syllable 4, which seems the best solution: *ánu ānónavīti* handily fills the post-caesura slot.

The referent of *pūrvī́ḥ* is unclear, at least to me. The standard tr. supply voices or the sounds of thunder vel sim., which Bṛhaspati is imitatating; see, e.g., HPS (222) "der viele (Stimmen dem Donner) nachbrüllt." (Similarly, but not identically, Mau sees the "many" as our praise hymns.) This strikes me as a rather distant notion to attach to the unspecified "many" and not in accord with the use of *ánu* √*nū* elsewhere. It is possible that *pūrvī́ḥ* signals a time period, as often (e.g., IV.19.8 *pūrvī́r uṣásaḥ śarádaś ca* ... "for many dawns and autumns"). However, I think this less likely than that *pūrvī́ḥ* refers to the feminine beings after which Bṛhaspati bellows. The lexeme *ánu* √*nū* takes an acc. of the longed-for object in both I.80.9 and VIII.82.33, and it is not difficult to supply the likely fem. acc. here: "cows" (also secondarily suggested by Re in his n.). Surely his freeing of the cows did not end Bṛhaspati's fond engagement with them: he yearned for them still.

On the opening of c, *bṛ́haspátiḥ sá*, see disc. ad vs. 7.

The lack of accent on the verb *dhāt* is surprising to me, since it must still be part of the *hí* clause begun in c, given the sequence of *sá* + instr. that unifies cd. Also surprising is the fact that no one comments on the absence (not even Old!). I would explain it by the fact that *váyo dhāḥ* (/*dhāt*) is a common hemistich ending (II.4.9; III.29.8, 51.6; IV.17.18; VI.40.1, 4; IX.90.6; X.46.10 [also pāda final in X.30.12]), where the verb is never accented. Either the poet simply reverted to this formulaic usage or the redactors adjusted it to that usage.

X.69–70

One hymn addressed to Agni, the other an Āprī hymn. The Anukr. ascribes them both to Sumitra B/Vādhryaśva, both names extracted from X.69. Although Vadhryaśva and the associated vṛddhied patronymic do appear to be PNs, *sumitrá-*, which occurs 5x in X.69, is best taken in its literal sense 'good ally, having good allies'. As for *vadhryaśvá-*, that an original bahuvrīhi 'having gelded horses' was reinterpr as a PN may be shown by the final accent (*vadhri-aśvá-*); we would otherwise expect **vádhri-aśva-*, with standard b-v accent like *vádhri-vāc-* (VII.18.9).

X.69 Agni

On the subject matter of the hymn, see publ. intro. The language is for the most part straightforward, at least superficially, but there are some twists. For much of the hymn the verses proceed in pairs; they are not technically Pragāthas, but they mirror and complete each other thematically and often share phraseology.

X.69.1–2: The first two vss. are not tightly bound, but they share the phrase *ghṛténāhutaḥ* (1d, 2c).

X.69.1: The two supposed PN *vadhryaśvá-* and *sumitrá-* that provide the poet's name in the Anukr. are both found in this 1st vs. As noted above (intro. to X.69–70), *sumitrá-* is better taken in its literal sense.

X.69.3–4: On the shared features of this pair, see disc. ad 4.

X.69.3: The double *yád* phrases, sharing the same verb *samīdhé* but paired with two different nominatives, clearly refer to two occasions in the past when the ritual fire was kindled, starting with the primordial institution of the sacrifice by Manu. The main clause *tád idáṃ návīyaḥ* then points to the ritual fire right here and emphasizes both its identity with those previous fires and its novelty. None of the standard renderings (Ge, Re, Proferes) fully registers the repeated *yád*'s; Re, esp., seems to have missed the point.

The 2nd hemistich has four occurrences of *sá* with 2nd ps. reference, each matched with an imperative (or imperative substitute like injunc. *dhā́h*) by (my) rule.

X.69.4: The first hemistich is modeled on 3ab:

3ab *yát te ..., samīdhé agne tád idám ...*

4ab *yáṃ tvā ..., samīdhé agne sá idám ...*

4a adds another previous (*pū́rvam*) kindling of the fire to those in 3ab, but this one is temporally close, since the kindler is Vadhryaśva, whose fire is the focus of this hymn. He is thus associated, in his first kindling, with the primal sacrificer Manu, but he is also responsible for a new kindling, in pāda b.

The referent of neut. *idám* in b is not specified. In the paired expression in 3b, it is Agni's *ánīkam*, and I supply that here as well. Ge suggests rather the hymn and the sacrifice, perhaps basing himself partly on *sá gíro juṣasva* in c, matching 4b *sá idáṃ juṣasva* save for the object. Re supplies "sacrifice," though in his n. he says that *idám* stands for the *gíraḥ* in the phrase in 3c; Proferes just "this." The parallelism of 3ab and 4ab seems to me to impose the *ánīkam* interpr.

Vadhryaśva is "solemnly invoked" (*īḷitá-*) at the first kindling in 4a. This ppl. ordinarily characterizes Agni, but Agni esp. in his role as Hotar (see, e.g., VII.7.3 *agnír īḷitó ná hótā*). The use of this term suggests that Vadhryaśva must have served as Hotar on that occasion and also implicitly identifies him with Agni, that is, with his own ritual fire.

X.69.5–6: Like vss. 3 and 4, this pair should be read together. It is the near repetition of 5c by 6c that allows us to identify "the son of Vadhryaśva" with Agni, on which see Proferes (40–41).

5c *śū́ra iva dhṛṣṇúś cyávanaḥ sumitráḥ*

6c *śū́ra iva dhṛṣṇúś cyávano jánānām*

X.69.5: Note the solemn and ceremonial *prá nú vocam* "I shall now proclaim," which links the announcement to others like it (e.g., I.32.1) and establishes the importance of the *name* of Vadhryaśva's son. The name is presumably "Agni," given in the next, paired vs., but not till pāda d.

X.69.6: The first hemistich flirts with another contender for the name of V's son, namely Indra, who is the usual conquerer of obstacles (*vṛtrā́ṇi*). And of course Indra is the target of *prá vocam* in I.32.1 just alluded to.

On the phrase *dā́sā vṛtrā́ṇi ā́ryā* see comm. ad VI.22.10.

X.69.7–8: The second hemistichs of both vss. are paired: the instr. pl. + pass. phrase in 7c *nṛ́bhiḥ mṛjyámānaḥ* is expanded in 8cd to *nṛ́bhir dákṣiṇāvadbhiḥ ... sumitrébhir idhyase devayádbhiḥ*, with the last two instr. also matching the loc. pl. of 7d *sumitréṣu ... devayátsu* in the same metrical position. The close pairing of the 2nd halves of these vss. draws attention to the sharp

thematic contrast between the barren cows (*-starī-*) in 7b and the milch-cow (*dhenú-*) of 8ab, on which see publ. intro.

X.69.7: Once again the phrase *ayám agníḥ* "this fire here" emphasizes the immediacy of the new fire. This suggests that *dīrghá-tantu-*, lit. 'having a long thread', should be interpr. with Proferes as referring to the "long line (of ancestors)," some of which we have met in vss. 3–4. The fire in front of us may be new, but it has deep roots.

The lofty bulls (*bṛhád-ukṣan-*) by contrast are probably his flames, as Ge suggests.

The puzzling descriptor is *sahásra-starī-* 'having a thousand barren cows', esp. since the barren cows seem to substitute for the harmless and well-integrated *-cetas-* found in the otherwise identical pāda I.100.12 *sahásracetāḥ śatánītha ṛbhvā* "of a thousand insights and a hundred counsels, skillful." (Curiously, Bl [RVReps] finds our version "insipid," an adj. I'd be more likely to apply to I.100.12.) Ge finds no clear reason for the barren cows (n. 7b), while Re and Old are silent on them. The impetus for their appearance here is, I think, to be found in the name of the fire's owner and producer, Vadhryaśva, Since his name literally means 'having gelded horses', his clan fire matches the nomenclatural model with "having a thousand sterile cows', with equally deficient livestock – a deprecatory model that reaches back into prehistory, most famously in Zarathustra 'having old camels' (by most interpr.). Happily we need not worry too much about the reality of this description, since in the next vs. Agni is credited with a 'milch-cow' (*dhenú-*), whose fecund productivity is described at length. As for the name Vadhryaśva, Hans Hock recently (AOS meeting, March 2024) pointed out that gelded horses are prized for racing, and so 'having gelded horses' need not be a deprecatory name after all.

X.69.8: On the *dhenú-* see comm. just above.

With Ge and Re (contra Gr, Old, who interpr. it as an instr. sg.), I take *asaścátā* as a dual fem. referring to Heaven and Earth. The same form is used of them in I.160.2 and *ásaścantī* of the same in VI.70.2.

Ge takes *dákṣiṇāvant-* as referring to the dispensers of Dakṣiṇās, namely, the Sūris or patrons, who, in his view, are the referents of *nṛ́bhiḥ* in 7c, 8c, 9d, and 11b. Since in all these occurrences but 9d (which is non-diagnostic) these men are ritual officiants, kindling (8c) and tending (7c) the fire and providing pressed soma (11b), they should instead be receiving the Dakṣiṇā, at least by later custom.

X.69.9–10: This pair of vss. don't share much phraseology or syntactic structure, but they are thematically (and partly lexically) connected. In both, Agni is identified as the son of Vadhryaśva and the beneficiary of his service, which enables Agni to overcome opponents. The patronymic voc. *vādhryaśva* takes the same position in 9b as the name *vadhryaśváḥ* in 10b. And the nearly synonymous 2nd sg. imperfects *ajayaḥ* and *avanoḥ* take the same positions in 9d and 10d. We can also note two different words that play off the PN Vadhryaśva: (*tvā́)vṛdhebhiḥ* (9d) and *vrā́dhataḥ* (10d).

X.69.9: As disc. in IV.18.2, I would now tr. *sampṛ́cham* as 'to consult'. As Proferes (41) points out, the *mā́nuṣīr víśaḥ* "clans of the sons of Manu" are Agni's (and Vadhryaśva's) own people, come to take counsel about an external threat (c), and it is with these men that Agni conquers in d. The publ. tr. makes the clans sound as if they're the enemy.

I would now slightly emend the tr. of d to "whose strengthener is you," to match *vṛdháḥ* in 11d, if that analysis is correct.

X.69.10: In pāda a *abibhar* is better read *abibharr* (< *-*rt*). See comm. ad VII.75.1 and Old.

The identity of those whom Agni vanquishes in d is not made explicit, and contextual clues pull in two different directions. On the one hand, the next vs. (11a) proclaims the victory of Vadhryaśva's fire over rivals (*śatrū́n*); the default interpr. would probably be of human rivals, enemies outside the domain of Vadhryaśva. This seems to be the Ge/Proferes interpr. On the other, *pū́rvān* 'previous, former' echoes *pū́rvam* in 4a, where it referred to a fire that Vadhryaśva had kindled previously, to which the current one is superior. This accounts for my tr. "the former (fires)," as also Re "(les Agni) antérieurs," sim. JSK (DGRV I.381). I think both might be meant (as Re rather awkwardly seems to indicate in his n.).

The position of *utá* is somewhat odd, but acdg. to JSK (same ref.) it joins the second hemistich with the first, despite appearing at the beginning of d. He adduces several similar exx.

On the formation and sense of *vrā́dhant-* see comm. ad X.49.8. We already noted the phonological similarity between this stem and the name *vadhryaśvá-*.

X.69.11–12: These two vss. do not seem twinned. Rather, vs. 11 gathers up a number of the elements of the immediately preceding vss., while vs. 12 is a hymn-summary vs.

X.69.11: In b *nṛ́bhir jigāya* matches 9d ... *nṛ́bhir ajayaḥ*, with both instr. *nṛ́bhiḥ* modified by a pāda-final instr. In d there reappear both *vrā́dhantam* (see 10d) and *vṛdhá-*, reinforcing the play with Vadhryaśva's name noted above.

The publ. tr., along with Ge and Proferes, tr. *sutásomavant-* as if it were synonymous with the well-attested bahuvrīhi *sutásoma-*, with a pleonastic possessive suffix *-vant-*. However, Re (and in fact Gr) must be correct that *-vant-* here signals accompaniment (like *índra-marútvant-* "Indra along with the Maruts"). I would now alter the tr. to "by means of the (aforementioned) men along with those who have pressed soma." The men (*nṛ́bhiḥ*) are the same as those in 9d.

There is disagreement about the identity of *vṛdháḥ* in d. The publ. tr. follows Sāy., Gr, and Proferes in taking it as the nom. sg. of the thematic stem *vṛdhá-*, found also in the cmpd *tvā́-vṛdha-* in 9d. Ge and Re take it rather as the abl. of the root noun *vṛ́dh-* and construe it with *vrā́dhantam*, which functions (for them) as a quasi-comparative: Ge "... die stärker fühlte als selbst der Starke" (see his n. 11d and Re's n.). This would cleverly bring *vrā́dhant-* and *vṛ́dh-* into conjunction and would also account for the position of *cid*. But it otherwise has little to recommend it, since *vrā́dhant-* is not a comparative, and Ge's supplying of extra material verges on the reckless. True – a nom. sg. *vṛdháḥ* is rhetorically a little flat, and the *cid* does not appear to limit it, but that hardly disqualifies it. The *cid* may have the position it does to emulate the vs.-final *cid* in 10d, where it limits *vrā́dhataḥ*; in our pāda it should likewise limit *vrā́dhatam* (so publ. tr.), which, however, is considerably earlier in the pāda.

X.69.12: This summary vs. begins with the annunciatory *ayám agníḥ* "here is Agni," found also, less prominently, in 7a.

Another phonological play on Vadhryaśva: *vṛtra(-hán-)*. This sonic link may help account for the application of this Indraic epithet to Agni (though this is not the only such

occasion), but the emphatic militancy of Vadhryaśva's fire provides another reason. It might be better rendered 'smasher of obstacles', although this would lose the phonological echo.

víjāmi-, clearly playing off *ájāmi-*, is a hapax and has been variously rendered. The publ. tr. 'estranged kin' (with *ví* 'apart') is due to JPB and seems the most persuasive of the possibilities.

X.70 Āprī

One of the two Āprī hymns in Maṇḍala X (the other being X.110). Re tr. in EVP XIV.47ff. There are connections esp. with the Āprī hymn VII.2.

X.70.1: For reasons unclear to me both Ge and Re tr. the instr. *devayajyā́* as a dative.

X.70.2: I take *ṛtásya pathā́* in c with ab, as more appropriate with a verb of motion (*yātu* in a) than with √*sūd* in d; cf. I.129.9 *yāhí pathā́m̐ anehásā* "drive along a faultless path" as well as exx. with other verbs of motion. However, the existence of other exx. of the sequence *ṛtásya pathā́ námasā* (I.128.2, X.31.2) does give me pause. Ge and Re take the hemistich break as the syntactic break, in contrast to my enjambment, which I still weakly prefer.

With Ge, Old, and Re, I take *miyédhaḥ* as belonging to a neut. *s*-stem, not the thematic *miyédha-* found elsewhere. As Old points out, in other Āprī hymns at the corresponding point we find an obj. *havyám*, *yajñám* et sim.

X.70.4–6: The part. *uśánt-* '(being) eager' figures prominently in these vss. (4d, 5c, 6c [2x]); see also 9d.

X.70.4: Note the pleasing etymological and phonetic figure *dīrghám drāghmā́*. On the instr. sg. *drāghmā́* (only here) to *drāgh(i)mán-* see AiG III.268. It is striking that the following vs. contains another instr. to a *-mán*-stem, *mahinā́* (5c) with a different shape. On that model we might have expected **drāgh(i)nā́* here.

X.70.5: Ge (n. 5a and see Re's tr.) is quite insistent that *várīyaḥ* is adverbial and does not modify *sā́nu*, as I take it. This is possible, but I don't know what "touch more widely" means, and both Ge and Re have to introduce some extra verbiage to make it make sense. See also 8a.

Contra Pp. but with all standard interpr., gen. *pṛthivyā́ḥ*, not instr. *pṛthivyā́*.

The apparent m. nom. sg. *rathayúḥ* is the problem in b, as also in the very similar Āprī vs. VII.2.5. We should expect a fem. nom. pl. here and a fem. acc. pl. in VII.2.5. Old (ad VII.2.5) simply suggests sg. for pl. (accepted by Wack., AiG III.159). But surely this substitution was occasioned by uncertainty on the part of the poet, or the redactors, as to what the fem. pl. form to such a stem should be. I therefore am sympathetic to Gr's *-yús* for **-yū́s*. In any case I don't know what the chariot is doing here.

X.70.7: Given the position of adverbial neut. *bṛhát*, it could go with both NPs. I suggest a minor adjustment to the tr.: "the pressing stone is loftily upright; the fire has been loftily kindled."

The phrasing of pāda b may seem somewhat opaque, but its purport seems clear. The "lap of Aditi" (e.g., IX.26.1, 71.5, 74.5; X.5.7) is generally a kenning for the ritual ground. The point here is that the ritual fire and the pressing stone both have their places there. (Somewhat

different, Ge and Re.) For the kindling of the fire in the lap of Aditi, see X.5.7. In the publ. tr. I would erase the ? after "ground."

The keyword in this vs. is *ṛtvijā*, substituting for the standard *daívyā hótārā* at this point in Āprī hymns.

X.70.8: As in 5a, *várīyaḥ* is placed pāda-final, following a neut. noun (*barhíḥ* in this case). I take it as modifying this noun; Ge and Re as adverbial. I doubt that the goddesses are urged to sit as far apart as possible, as a species of social distancing; rather, that the barhis has been widely spread. See, e.g., I.85.6 *sīdatā barhír urú vaḥ sádas kṛtám* "Sit on the barhis; a wide seat has been made for you."

X.70.9: In the Āprī hymns Tvaṣṭar, as shaper of creatures and releaser of the semen that produces them, is also called on, conversely, to start the journey of one of his created creatures, the sacrificial animal, to its death, a task continued by Vanaspati "Lord of the Forest" (=sacrificial post), who occupies the next vs. in the litany. Because of the taint of death, both the Tvaṣṭar and Vanaspati vss. in Āprī hymns are often euphemistic and/or underdeveloped, and our vs. is no exception. (For further on Tvaṣṭar and Vanaspati and their occasional conflation, see comm. ad II.3.9.) In pāda a "has attained/achieved loveliness" (*cārutvám ā́naṭ*) is a reference to Tvaṣṭar's role as the shaper of creatures, as Ge (n. 9a) points out. Re suggests that the phrase has a loose connection to the epithet *viśvá-rūpa-* 'having/providing all forms' that is used of Tvaṣṭar in other Āprī hymns. I do not understand the connection of the Aṅgirases in pāda b.

Pāda c is almost identical to 10b, addressed to Vanaspati, and so Tvaṣṭar is essentially identified with Vanaspati here, as sending the sacrificial animal "into the fold of the gods." However, because of its inauspicious nature it contains neither verb nor object. The verb can be supplied from *vakṣi* ('convey') in 10b, but the victim is never directly expressed in the Āprī hymns. The object is either gapped or the anodyne 'oblation' (*havís-*) is substituted; see *havī́ṃṣi* in the second hemistich of 10.

X.70.10: The gerund phrase in pāda a, *raśanáyā niyū́yā* "harnessing with a halter" comes closer than other Āprī hymns to acknowledging the animal victim. The object is still gapped, but one doesn't harness a generic *havís-* with a halter.

[X.71–72 JPB]

X.71 Wisdom [SJ on JPB]

Also tr. by Re, *Hymnes spéculatifs* 71–73.

X.71.1: I would slightly alter some lexical choices in the publ. tr. – first substituting "when they set out" for "came forth." I think *praírata* serves almost as an aux. with *dádhānāḥ* -- close to "when they set about giving names." Speech is first deployed in the creation of things by dividing them and giving them individual names.

I do not think that we should supply "name" as the referent for the *yád ... tád* in the 2nd hemistich, contra the publ. tr., because I don't think there was just a single name. Rather the referent is both more global and less precise – a maximalizing rel. cl. of the type "whatever of theirs was best ..."

The publ. tr.'s expansion of the instr. *preṇā́* to "because of your affection (for them)," with "your" referring to Bṛhaspati, is certainly an appealing interpr. (sim. also HPS B+I 124), but it is scarcely the only one – and there is no overt support for it in the passage. It could rather be *their* love (so Re, *Hymnes spéc*: "par l'effet de leur amour"), or simply unspecified love. I think it safest to tr. unadorned "by love."

X.71.2: Although we might expect that this vs. would remain in the distant past depicted in vs. 1 – and therefore might tr. aor. *ákrata* as "they created," not the publ. tr. "they have created" – the pres.-tense verb of the main cl., *jānate*, supports the recent past of the publ. tr.

On the other hand, I think that the middle voice of both *ákrata* and *jānate* needs to be represented in the tr. In ab I do not think that the Wise created the goddess Speech, but rather each (or all together) created their own speech individually. I would therefore de-cap Speech and de-gender the pronoun: "When the wise have created their own speech by their thought, purifying it ..."

But in pāda c, after they have each made their own individual speech, they recognize their commonalities and their comradeship in the joint (ritual) enterprise. I would alter this tr. to "then as comrades they mutually recognize their comradeship." The vs. seems to set forth a model for the integration of different priests representing different types of ritual speech into a unified ritual – though the application of the vs. need not be so restricted.

Since *lakṣmī́* is a RVic hapax, it's difficult to determine what it is meant to convey here – perhaps the "brand" or "stamp" of their unified ritual?

X.71.3: This vs. certainly supports the specifically ritual interpr. of vs. 2. Once again speech is divided and parceled out to the various priests, who then perform their parts in concert.

Although I like the publ. tr.'s "The ... singers together cry her out," with speech as the product of the action *abhí sáṃ navante*, I am afraid that the standard usage of this verbal lexeme and similar ones to √*nū́* does not support this tr. – but rather an interpr. in which speech is the goal of the verb: "cry out *to*," as the other standard tr. take it (e.g., JSK DGRV I.414 "Unto her do the seven singers shout in unison"). Accusatives with this lexeme always express the personal goal of the noise being made. On the only apparent exception, see comm. ad VIII.8.12. I would therefore emend the tr. here to "The ... singers together cry out to her."

X.71.4–5: Note the sequence of *utá tva-* (4a, b, c, 5a).

X.71.5: I would substitute "stiff and bloated" for "stiff and swollen."

I would emend the tr. of *carati* in c to "he behaves" and delete the "an": "he behaves with artifice that is no milk-cow."

X.71.6: On suffix-accented *sukṛtá-* as a noun, 'good work, good action', see comm. ad III.29.8. I would therefore emend to "does not know the path of good action."

X.71.8: I would make the minor change of "knowing ways" to "wise ways."

The cmpd *óha-brahman-* is much discussed (see, e.g., Old) and variously translated. I follow the publ. tr. in taking it as a bahuvrīhi based on a dvandva **oha-brahmán-* 'laud(s) (and) formulation(s)'; for independent parallel use of these two noun stems see I.61.1 ... *óham índrāya bráhmāṇi* "(I bring forward) a laud (and) formulations for Indra."

X.71.8–9: Although we generally take the vṛddhi deriv. *brāhmaṇá-*, confined to the late RV, as a designation of the priestly class/varṇa, and reserve *brahmán-* for the Formulator priest, in this passage its connection to the *bráhman-* 'formulation' and to speech in general seems strong enough to license a tr. 'Formulator-priests' for the term in 8b and 9b. On the one hand, in 8d they are characterized as possessing lauds and formulations (*óha-brahman-*; see just above), and on the other in 9b they are contrasted with *suté-kara-* '(those) active at the soma-pressing': the pair *brāhmaṇā́saḥ ... suté-karāsaḥ* shows the standard contrast between priestly speech and priestly action. (See the further division of priestly roles in the final vs. 11.) I would alter the tr. of 8ab to "When ... the Formulator-priests perform ..." and of 9b to "who are not Formulator-priests nor active at the soma-pressing."

X.71.9: It is difficult to know what's going on in pāda c because the lexeme *abhí √pad* is found only here in the RV and only once elsewhere in early Vedic: an imperative *abhi padyasva* appears in AVP X.12.12, where Death is urged to *abhi-pad* a dead enemy; there 'fall upon' (as in the publ. tr.) or 'take hold of' seems reasonable. The use of the lexeme explodes in middle Vedic, particularly the ŚB, where 'take hold of, take possession of' seems to prevail. The 'use, employ' rendering found in most of the standard tr. (Ge, Re [Spéc], Don) is tempting and could be a dev. of what is found in middle Vedic. Though I'm reluctant to make the chronological leap, such an interpr. makes more sense of the passage, and so I suggest, at least as an alt., "having employed speech in an evil way."

The fem. pl. *sirī́ḥ* is a hapax, of unclear meaning (see EWA s.v.), but "streams (of water)" seems a plausible interpr. and fits the context nicely. It also is reminiscent of the likewise hapax *sirā́-* in I.121.11, which also seems to mean 'stream'.

The negated redupl. adj. *áprajajñi-* is standardly tr. 'ignorant' and assigned to the root *√jñā*, but it could equally well belong to *√jan* and mean, per the publ. tr., "producing nothing." See Old and Ge's n. 9cd. Both roots regularly appear with the preverb *prá*, and either meaning works well here. I assume that the ambiguity was meant and would tr. "... producing nothing / ignorant(ly)."

X.71.10: Given the suffixal accent of *yaśásā*, the publ. tr. "with a companion who has come in glory ..." should be emended to "with a glorious companion who has come here victorious in the assembly."

All the standard tr. (also Scar 665) except the publ. tr. take c and d as separate clauses, but this cannot be correct: the accent of *bhávati* in d must have been triggered by the *hí* in c.

X.71.11: Since all four of the subjects in this vs. are expressed with the indefinite unaccented prn. *tva-* that has dominated in other parts of the hymn (vss. 4–5, 7cd, 8cd), I would replace the definite pairs "the one ... the other" (ab and cd) with "one ... another."

The phrase *āste pupuṣvā́n* was interpreted by Delbrück (AiS 391) as a periphrasis ("keeps ... / continually occupies himself"): "der eine beschäftigt sich dauernd mit Uebung der ṛc." This is a possible though not necessary interpr. A possible alt. tr. would be "the one [=Hotar] keeps constantly blooming ..."

X.72 Gods (/Creation) [SJ on JPB]

Also tr. by Re, *Hymnes spéculatifs* 75–76.

X.72.1: This 1st vs. provides us with two puzzles. The first is simply a matter of where to draw the clause boundary: does the loc. phrase occupying pāda c belong with the main cl. in ab (Ge, Re) or with the subord. cl. in d (publ. tr., Don)? Related is the question of whether it is a "real" loc., integrated into the clause structure ("... proclaim in hymns being recited") or a loc. absol. ("when hymns are being recited"). The decisions on this question match that of the clause division (Ge, Re v. Don, JPB). Either is possible; I have a slight preference for the former and suggest an alt. "... we will proclaim ... in hymns being recited").

The 2nd puzzle is more intractable: the *yáḥ* opening pāda d is about as "improper" a relative as it is possible to be. There is no masc. sg. referent in any of the three preceding pādas, and it is difficult even to imagine who or what might be referred to. The publ. tr. takes it as substitution for *yáthā* in a purpose cl. ("so that one ... will see ..."; sim. Re, Don); Ge takes it as if a simple "wenn"; Old seems to suggest that it picks up the "we" of the main cl. None of these is very satisfactory, nor will mine be – but I tentatively suggest that there's a suppressed pronominal antecedent in the main cl., **tásmai*: "We will proclaim ... (to/for him) who will see ..."

X.72.2: The referent of *etā́* is unspecified and the number/gender open (neut. pl., masc. du.?). The publ. tr. (along with Sāy.) chooses the neut. pl., with the referent the "births" (*jā́nā*) of the previous vs. (1a). This seems the right course. Ge (n. 2a) prefers the (two) worlds, as do Re and Don. Although X.81.3 *sám ... dhámati ... dyā́vābhū́mī* "he smelts together Heaven and Earth" lends support to the latter interpr., it also raises the problem that "Heaven and Earth" is a *feminine* dvandva, and we should expect the prn. to be *eté* (for such pronominalization see, e.g., VII.53.1 *dyā́vā ... pṛthivī́ ... / té* ...). It's also the case that H+E are not found in our context. So this seems the less likely choice.

X.72.3: The referents (or non-referential adverbial usage) of the two *tád*-s in cd are unclear and much discussed; see esp. Old and Ge n. 3cd. The publ. tr. essentially follows Old. I have no independent view, but the endless loop of vs. 4 supports the Old–JPB interpr.

X.72.4: Note that the nom. / abl. pair # *bhū́r* ... # *bhuvá(ḥ)* anticipates the Mahāvyāhṛti formula *bhūr bhuvaḥ svar*. Since I don't know the history of that formula, I do not know if a misinterpr. of this vs. contributed anything to it. The word *svàr* does not occur in this hymn, though see the metaphorical birth of *sū́rya-* in 7d.

There is perhaps also a pun on the root √*bhū* 'coming into existence, becoming',

X.72.5: I doubt that the first hemistich here is the causal basis of the second (per the publ. tr.). Rather I think *hí* looks backward to 4d (so most of the standard tr.), and the izafe-like nominal rel. cl. in b should be integrated into the whole (so Ge, Don): (4cd) "From Aditi, Dakṣa was born, and from Dakṣa, Aditi." (5ab) "For Aditi was born as your daughter, o Skill." Then start a new cl. with cd: "After her the gods were born ..."

Although all the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) render *amṛ́ta-bandhu-* as a tatp. "kin of the immortal one" (JPB), all flg. Gr's "Genosse der Unsterblichkeit," its accent identifies it as a bahuvrīhi -- which should then mean something like "whose lineage/kinship is with/to the immortal." The difference is perhaps small, but I think it should be registered.

X.72.6: It's possible that *átiṣṭhata* is a semi-auxiliary with *súsaṃrabdhāḥ* rather than having independent lexical meaning. That is, it may not refer to the gods literally *standing* in the ocean, but rather mean something like "when you stayed well clasped together in the ocean ..."

The suggestion of the publ. tr. that "dust" in the simile refers to the dancers' sweat is clever, esp. since the dust in the frame would also be liquid, i.e., spray. But since the rising of dust is elsewhere a sign of energetic activity like warfare, it could refer to the real dust that arises from dancers' forceful footwork.

X.72.8–9: This is the first clear expression of the famous myth of the births of the Ādityas, two by two, much treated in Vedic prose. For reff. and disc. see JPB *Ādityas* 244–45, and for disc. esp. of the miscarriage of Mārtāṇḍa my *Hyenas* 204–7.

X.72.9: The two datives in c *prajăyai* and *mṛtyáve* serve as quasi-infinitives, and such a tr. makes the point of the verse clearer – that is, that the miscarried Mārtāṇḍa is the source of the human race, which procreates and dies. Substitute "(But) she brought the one stemming from a dead egg here [= to earth] again, to procreate and then to die." For a similar infinitival use of *prajăyai* see the next hymn, X.73.5.

X.73–74

Two hymns to Indra attributed to Gaurivīti Śāktya. The Anukr. also attributes to him V.29, another Indra hymn, where the poet names himself in vs. 11, and the first two vss. of IX.108. On possible thematic connections between V.29 and IX.108.1–2 see comm. ad IX.108.1–2; for possible thematic connections between V.29 and X.73 see comm. ad X.73.8.

X.73 Indra

On the structure and contents of this difficult hymn, see the publ. intro. Caland-Henry give a complete (though very loose) translation, pp. 301ff., and HPS treats the hymn in a 2002 article, "Ṛgveda 10.73" (StII 23).

X.73.1: Note the rhyming forms at the beginning and end of the vs.: # *jániṣṭhā(ḥ) ... (d)hániṣṭhā*, though they are morphologically distinct: 2nd sg. mid. injunctive and fem. superlative respectively.

The adj. *ugrá-* in pāda a is matched by its superlative *ójiṣṭha-* in b, whose etymological connection would have been clear to Vedic speakers despite their phonological divergence.

On the various meanings of *abhí* √*man* see comm. ad X.27.11. Here I think the sense is 'have designs on / intentions towards', i.e., 'plans'. I don't know where Ge gets his "von reichlichem Selbstgefühl."

The pf. subj. *dadhánat* is anomalous in two ways: 1) it appears to be transitive, though most of the other forms of the pf. of √*dhan* are intransitive (incl. *dadhanvăn* in X.113.2; see comm. ad loc.) (see Kü 255–56); 2) it does not have the usual value of the perfect subjunctive. As I established in my article on the perfect subjunctive (García Ramón Fs.), the vast majority of these forms supply the only subjunctives to their roots and have simple subjunctive value ("will/shall X") without any "perfect" nuance at all. However, such an interpr. does not work here: the form is in a subordinate clause, whose main clause has an imperfect (*ávardhan*), and the whole refers to the mythic past, the birth of Indra. As far as I can see, it is not possible to

avoid interpr. *dadhánat* as a past prospective (Kü 156: "Prospektiv der Vergangenheit") "was going to set to running / moving." Whether the two anomalous features are related is not clear.

We might, however, try to figure out the mythological situation being depicted. And in my view this requires taking a closer look at the superlative that ends the vs.: *dhániṣṭhā.* On the surface, we have a straightforward, somewhat banal, etymological figure *dadhánad dhániṣṭhā* "(she), the best runner, was going to set (him) to running." However, in this sandhi position, the superlative could also stand for *hániṣṭhā* to √*han* 'smite'. Recall that Indra's birth was a troubled one, at least as depicted in the famous hymn IV.18, where Indra in utero declines to be born vaginally and instead comes out of his mother's side (IV.18.1–2). I wonder if √*han* in a birthing context could refer to what is called "pushing" in modern English: the movements the mother makes to expel the fetus from the birth canal: "slamming" might be what √*han* expresses. Thus "best at pushing/slamming" would identify Indra's mother as possessing the skill and strength to give birth even to Indra, despite his prodigious qualities. I also wonder if *dadhánat* refers to the movement of the baby through the birth canal: "she, best at pushing, was going to set him in motion." The perfect subjunctive here might express a potential thwarted: she was going to make him move through the birth canal, but he went out her side instead.

Alternatively, we might consider the rather confused situation depicted later in IV.18. At various points in that hymn it seems that his mother abandons him and goes away (IV.18.3, also 4, 8), which could fit with the reading *dhániṣṭhā* "(she) best at running (away)." But closest to our phrase is the sequence in IV.18.10–11, in which (in my interpr.) his mother "impelled her calf to wander" (10a, c ... *sasūva ... vatsáṃ caráthāya mātā́*) and then followed after him (11a *utá mātā́ mahiṣám ánv avenat*). Our *dadhánat* could correspond to vs. 10 and *dhániṣṭhā* to 11a – though I prefer my birth interpr. A final alternative interpr. of *dadhánat* could take it as intransitive, referring to the mother's own running, following after her son, as in IV.18.11a.

So, to summarize, I have suggested three different interpr. of the obscure pāda d, one depicting the birth itself, two soon after the birth:

1) When the mother, best at pushing/slamming, was going to set the hero in motion [=expel him from the birth canal].

2) When the mother, best at running [/smiting], was going to set the hero to run [=send him away from her].

3) When the mother, best at running, was going to run after the hero [after she had sent him away].

I prefer no. 1.

Any of these interpr. rests on taking IV.18 as a widespread, fairly standard depiction of Indra's birth – an assumption that we can, of course, not count on. One thing that calls into question my use of IV.18 as background for our vs. is the fact that the Maruts do not figure in IV.18, though in X.73.1 they occupy the main clause (c) on which our *yád* clause is dependent. I do not know other references to Indra's birth that involve the Maruts.

X.73.2: This vs. is considerably more baffling than even the one before. But we do have one thing to hang onto: pāda b ... *vāvṛdhuṣ ṭá índram* echoes 1c *ávardhann índram* ... Since the Maruts are the subject in 1c, they are likely the referents of *té* in 2b. This further suggests that the female in 2a is identical to the mother in 1d. The pādas in the two hemistichs are simply flipped: 1cd: Maruts / Indra's mother; 2ab Indra's mother / Maruts. This is essentially Ge's view of the structure too (n. 2a), though I don't quite understand his view of the sense of pāda a.

It further seems that the fine plans that Indra's mother had in 1d have not come to pass, and she is considerably chastened (*níṣattā* 'sunk down'). I agree with Ge that what has reduced her to this state are the "ways of deceit / the activities of the Lie," referring to harm intended for her infant Indra by enemies, not any hostile actions against him on her part. But the enemy/enemies is/are not identified. Old is in general agreement, though he considers the possibility that it is the mother whose hostility against her son is at issue. He also toys with the female as the Maruts' mother, on the basis of the similarity between the word *pṛśanī́* and the Maruts' mother Pṛśni, but though a phonological play is surely intended, the structure of the passages imposes Indra's mother.

Despite her demoralized state, she still expresses affection for the newborn – or so I interpr. *pṛśanī́*. On the fem. stem *pṛśanī́* as well as related forms, see comm. ad IX.97.54. The two fem. pl. forms *pṛśanyàs* (I.71.5, IX.97.54) seem to mean 'caresses' (Re EVP XVI.137: "gestes d'amour pour attirer"), but our nom. sg. occurrence must refer to a person and hence an agent: caresser, one who caresses. I do not, with Ge and Re (loc. cit.), think it has developed here to mean 'courtesan' or the like: Ge Buhlerin, EWA Liebeslockung, Buhlerin, Kurtisane. Rather, Indra's mother is bestowing affection on her newborn, despite the circumstances.

Starting with the 2nd hemistich of this vs. through the first one of vs. 5, the contents become extremely obscure, though much of it seems to concern prodigious births and Indra's part in them. For my quite speculative interpr. see publ. intro.

With most others I take *tā́* as neut. pl. referring to the worlds or beings (see Ge n. 2cd). They are "covered over" (*abhī́vṛtā*) by a great footprint (*mahāpadéna*) that seems to obstruct light and movement, but the same covering seems to have sexual overtones (as in a cow "covered" by a bull), given the immediate production of *gárbha*s in the next pāda. It seems likely that the footprint is Indra's, since his feet feature in the next vs., 3a.

Ge (n. 2d) takes the embryos as everything that comes out of the darkness, esp. rivers and the lights of heaven – which makes it sound like a mash-up of the Vṛtra and Vala myths. Old suggests that d depicts the Maruts' birth, but gives no evidence. I'm more inclined to see the referents as generic living beings, which could be generated by a sexual encounter – since it seems likely that Indra impregnated the worlds when he covered them with his big "foot." But since I really don't know what's going on in these vss., I am not insistent.

X.73.3: As was just noted, Indra's "lofty feet" (*ṛṣvā́ ... pā́dā*) here suggest that the big foot of 2a is also Indra's.

In b Indra is once again strengthened (*ávardhan*), but his strengtheners are no longer the Maruts as in 1c and probably 2d), but the Vājas and unspecified others who were on the scene (*utá yé cid átra*). Caland-Henry (302) think these latter are the Maruts, and the repetition of *cid átra* from 1c might support this identification. As for the Vājas, Ge, flg. Sāy., takes them to be the Ṛbhus. It is certainly the case that plural *vā́ja-* is used of, or at least adjacent to, the Ṛbhus (e.g., IV.36.2–4, 7), but the Ṛbhus aren't, as far as I know, ordinarily implicated in Indra's birth or strengthening.

Pāda c brings the surprising intrusion of the hyenas (*sālāvṛkā́n*), a thousand of which Indra takes into his mouth. Ge (n. 3c) thinks this is a measure of the great size of Indra's mouth, esp. given the fearsomeness of the jaws of the hyenas. He explicitly denies that the mention here has anything to do with the "bekannte Sage," in which Indra feeds a group of priests to hyenas. As I discuss in my extensive treatment of this "well-known saga" (*Ravenous Hyenas*, 1991), I think Ge is wrong here. The word *sālāvṛká-* and its relatives are rare in Vedic; it only occurs

twice in the RV, and only once in connection with Indra. It seems extremely unlikely that the widespread Brāhmaṇa story (already in Saṃhitā prose) of Indra and the hyenas isn't in the poet's mind. I treat this RVic passage in *Hyenas* pp. 78–79 and argue that our RVic passage depicts a scene of parental tenderness: adult hyenas carry their young in their mouths like cats. Here I think the *gárbha*s that Indra generated in 2cd are now being carted around in his mouth.

But the scene shifts abruptly to current-day ritual, and Indra is urged to turn the Aśvins our way, presumably to the early morning sacrifice that they are esp. associated with.

X.73.4: The journey of Indra and the Aśvins continues in 4ab, with 4b a slightly elaborated version of the last two words of 3cd (*aśvínā vavṛtyāḥ*). But in the second half of the vs. we return to matters of procreation in the past.

The adv. *samanā́* 'in the same way' must refer to Indra's repetition of his habitual journey to the sacrifice. It may also be meant to play off *sánāmānā* in 6a, likewise vs.-initial. Gr suggests that in this passage *samanā́* introduces the first clause in a coordinated structure "sowohl ... als auch," and a similar interpr. seems to underlie Caland-Henry's "En même temps que ..." (302), but this adverb is not otherwise so used, and in any case I think we'd expect the first verb to be accented.

I would now change "—swiftly—" to "advancing, you drive to the sacrifice," with a more apt sense of *tū́rṇi-*. For the meaning and root affiliation of this stem, see comm. ad III.11.5.

The rendering of *sakhyā́ya* as 'fellowship' in the publ. tr. would be better as "for comradeship" to harmonize with *sákhibhiḥ* in 5b.

The difficult 2nd hemistich is parallel to the difficult 2nd hemistich of 3:

3cd *tvám indra sālāvṛkā́n sahásram, āsán dadhiṣe* (/) *aśvínā ...*

4cd *vasā́vyām indra dhārayaḥ sahásrā,* (/) *aśvínā ...*

The points of contact include the direct object 'thousand(s)' (*sahásram*, *sahásrā*), a 2nd sg. verb 'take, hold, make fast' (*dadhiṣe*, *dhārayaḥ*), a loc. indicating where the thousand(s) are held (*āsán*, *vasā́vyām*), and an abrupt shift to a new clause beginning *aśvínā* -- as well as a voc. *indra* (the least important point of contact). Though both half-verses are difficult to interpr., they should be interpreted in tandem, or at least as deliberately contrastive. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think 4cd is another depiction of prodigious birth, with Indra engendering thousands of offspring in a single female. I don't think that these thousands are the same ones Indra was carrying in his mouth in the previous vs. – though that is far from excluded, esp. if we take 3cd as chronologically later than 4cd (as often in RVic recountings of myth). But whether they are narratively connected or not, the point is that Indra is responsible for massive fertility.

The otherwise unknown female *vasā́vī-* can be either the wife of a/the good one (*vásu-*) or of someone named Vasu (see Mayr. PN s.v.). I favor the former, since Indra's fecundity is clearly viewed favorably.

X.73.5: In my view, the first hemistich summarizes the accounts in the last few vss. of Indra's generative powers: Indra achieved his goal (*ártham*, b), which was to produce progeny (*prajāyai*, a; on *prajā́yai* as a quasi-infinitive see also VII.36.9 and probably the preceding hymn, X.72.9). He did so "from truth" (*ṛtā́d ádhi*), that is (probably), from his adherence to the sacrificial model and to proper procedures. See I.36.11 where Agni is kindled *ṛtā́d ádhi*. My interpr. of the sense would be clearer with some rearrangement: "... with his vigorous comrades Indra (went) to his goal, to produce progeny from truth."

Indra reached his goal along with, or with the help of, his comrades (*sákhibhiḥ*). Although Indra has been prominently associated with the Aśvins in the last few vss, (3d, 4b, d) and indeed he conveyed them "for comradeship" (*sakhyā́ya*) in 4b, the plural of *sákhibhiḥ* cannot be exclusively identified with the two Aśvins. Perhaps, with Sāy., the Maruts (see Ge n. 5b), who figured in vss. 1–2, or all the sidekicks previously named: the Maruts, the Vājas (/Ṛbhus?) and the others there at the time (3b), as well as the Aśvins.

The topic of procreation is now at an end, and the poet turns to more usual Indraic fare, his great victories over enemies. The first up is a *dasyú-*. who may well be Vṛtra, since the foe has *māyā́*s (see I.32.4 *māyínām ... māyā́ḥ* "the wiles of the wily one [=Vṛtra]") and the battle takes place amid mists (*míhaḥ*) and darkness that have been scattered (see I.32.13), both passages in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32. I do have to note that Namuci is rendered "without wiles" (*vímāya-*) in 7b, so it is possible that Namuci is the referent here.

Essentially all comm. and tr. supply *māyā́bhiḥ* with *ā́bhiḥ* in c, for good reason.

Again with all comm. and tr. (Ge, C–H 302, Lü 180, HPS), I take the *hí* cl. of c with the main cl. of d.

X.73.6: The action and personnel (besides Indra) in the first hemistich are not clear. As for personnel, there are two "of the same name" (*sánāmanā*) as well as a singleton in the dative. If we start with the latter, we can begin to unravel the passage, for the dative is the unaccented *asmai*, which must refer to a referent already in the discourse. In my view, this can only be the *dasyú-* of 5c – though Ge (n. 6a) suggests rather Namuci, who figures in vs. 7, and HPS also considers this possibility. However, unaccented *asmai* speaks against this (unless Namuci is the *dasyú* in 5c, which is possible but less likely than Vṛtra, in my opinion – despite *vímāya-* in 7b; see disc. just above).

To get closer to an identification of the two "of the same name," we must first tackle the verb *ní dhvasayaḥ*. The stem *dhvasáya-* (3x) belongs to the root √*dhvaṃs* 'smoke' (in my view), and as I discussed in my *-áya*-Formations monograph (54–55), I consider all three occurrences intransitive, in the sense 'smoke, produce smoke', The two occurrences of the participle in I.140.3, 5 refer to Agni and his flames respectively, and an intransitive sense seems to me clear, though those who wish to impose a transitive interpr. (like Ge) supply objects. The occurrence here is generally taken as transitive; see not only Ge, but Gotō (1st Class, 60 and 190, with lit. in n. 351). The object is taken to be the dual *sánāmānā*, and the referents are then identified as the two wives of Namuci, who are supposed to be hostilely dealt with in I.104.3 and V.30.9. All of this turns out to be a tissue of speculation, which evaporates on examination. In V.30.9 women are mentioned in the context of Namuci, but those women are *plural* (*stríyaḥ*). Moreover, Indra does them no damage. In I.104.3 there are indeed *two* females, but there is no mention of Namuci in this hymn; in fact they are called "the two maidens of Kuyava" (*kúyavasya yóṣe*). Though a bad end is wished for them, they have nothing to do with Namuci. (For further on these passages, see comm. ad locc. and publ. intros. to both hymns; in both cases I think we're dealing with rivers.) Thus, not only is *asmai* unlikely to refer to Namuci on syntactic grounds, but Namuci is not elsewhere associated with a pair of females.

Moreover, *sánāmānā* need not be – and in fact is unlikely to be – feminine. The number of feminines built to *n*-stems is quite limited; see Lanman (Noun Inflection, 528). However, Lanman cites a number of fem. bahuvrīhis built to *-nāman-* in the AV, which are suffixed with *-ī*, e.g., *durnā́mnī-*, *páñcanāmnī-*, etc. Though no such forms are found in the RV, in this late hymn it is likely that the AV practice would have been followed (expect **sánāmnī-*). Therefore

sánāmānā is probably masc. What then are its referents? Old suggests dual body parts of the Dasyu or Indra's two *hárī*, neither of which is terribly plausible. Ge (n. 6a) reports Fay as suggesting Vṛtra and Dānu. (Sāy. is silent on referents.) We need to ask: in the context of this hymn who would be "the two with the same name"? This produces an obvious answer: the Aśvins (/Nāsatyas], who have been insistently mentioned by name in the dual in 3d, 4b, 4d. What has impeded accepting this obvious answer has been the assumption that the two of the same name must be enemies of Indra subjected to a hostile action expressed by the verb *ní dhvasayaḥ*, and the Aśvins would not fit. But if the verb is neither transitive nor necessarily hostile, the way is cleared. In my view *ní dhvasayaḥ* continues the picture of the immediately preceding pāda, 5d, where Indra scatters mist and darkness to obfuscate the place of battle. Here he sends down smoke for the same purpose; the smoke is "for" the Dasyu (*asmai*), a dative of malefit. But it also beclouds his companions, the Aśvins. Note that the Aśvins are called *dhvasrā́* in X.40.3, and since they travel in the early morning, it is not surprising that they become obscured by morning mist and, here, by Indra's smokescreen.

In c *ṛṣvá-* 'lofty', which characterized Indra's feet in 3a, returns to modify his comrades (*sákhibhiḥ*) of 5b.

Opinion is divided on the morphological identity of *pratiṣṭhā́ hṛ́dyā*. The Pp. reads both words with final *-ā*, hence as instr. sgs. Old accepts the Pp. reading, as does Scar (651–52), supplying the enemy as object of *jaghantha*. Gr reads underlying *pratiṣṭhā́s hṛ́dyās*, fem. acc. pls., perfectly possible in this sandhi context. In this he is followed by Ge, C-H, HPS, and the published tr. Although either is technically possible, I find it harder to imagine how Indra would wield "firm standing / foundation" as a weapon, so I prefer the acc. interpr.

X.73.7: On Namuci as *vímāya-* see disc. ad 5c. On the connection of Manu's path with Namuci, see V.30.7.

The identity of the "seer" in b, for whose benefit Namuci was rendered wileless is not entirely certain. It most likely refers to Manu, also benefited in pāda c. But Ge (n. 7b) alternatively suggests Namī Sāpya, who is associated with Indra in the Namuci battle in I.53.7 (see comm. ad loc.) and VI.20.6 (see also X.48.9).

X.73.8: The expression *nā́māni* √*prā* "fulfill (your) names" is found also in the next hymn (by the same poet), X.74.6. It must refer to Indra's performing the deeds encapsulated in his epithets (so also Ge, n. 8a) and gestures towards the complex interrelationship between words and actions in Vedic India. For a similar exploration of this theme, see VIII.80.

The object of *dadhiṣe* in b is most likely the names of pāda a, producing a strikingly physical image of Indra holding his names in his fist.

Pāda c is almost identical to I.102.1, but in scrambled order. As I did there, I take *śávasā* as referring to Indra's power, which incites the gods' acclaim. Ge (and others) take it as semi-adverbial (Ge "mächtig"), referring to the energy with which the gods cheer Indra on.

The puzzling pāda is d, and my interpr. is quite different from the standard, in two ways. The standard assumes that *vanínaḥ* must refer to trees, but, though *vanín-* often has that referent, it literally just means 'wooden, having wood' and, in my view, could refer to any wooden object. My second deviation from the standard is more controversial: I suggest that d should be read with the first pāda of the next vs. (9a), with 9b beginning a new clause. I do not make these departures lightly, but the standard interpr. seems to me to lead to very unlikely scenarios and also produces syntactic problems in 9ab. Ge (n. 8d) suggests that turning the trees upside down,

with roots facing up, is just a metaphorical expression "für die umwälzenden Taten des Indra," but the image seems too precise to serve vague metaphorical ends. HPS tr. "You have made the trees aboveground," suggesting that Indra's separation of the two world halves allowed the trees to grow (not a standard result of this standard cosmogonic deed). I think rather that the 'wooden' things are chariots or pieces of chariots, including the wheel in 9a, and that this is another obscure reference to the chariot race between Indra and the Sun, in which Indra tears the wheel off the Sun's chariot and also reverses the position of the chariots (a topsy-turvy image). See the tantalizing hints in the Indra hymns of the Vth Maṇḍala, esp. V.29.5, 9–10 and V.31.11). I unfortunately don't have a precise image in mind, but the sudden reversals in the passages in V and the prominence of the wheel there suggests that this is a promising direction to explore – esp. since the poet of our hymn is also the poet of V.29, per the Anukramaṇī. (One can also think of Karṇa's wheel stuck in the earth in the climactic MBh battle.) Given the uncertainties of the situation depicted, the referent of *asya* is not clear to me, but see below.

X.73.9: For my suggestion that 8d and 9a form a sentence, see immediately preceding disc. One of the further advantages of this interpr. is that, if the *yád* clause of 9a leans backwards, this configuration avoids the awkwardness of trying to make 9b, with its initial *utá*, into its main clause. Both Ge and JSK (DGRV I.453) give *utá* the sense 'also' here, but *utá* is of course a coordinating conjunction and should not connect subordinate and main clauses. (However, see the disc. of problematic *utá* in 10b.) Moreover, the sense Ge and JSK give the whole – that Indra can find the good in any situation, even one like 9a – seems foreign to Indra's character; he is no Pollyanna-esque optimistic stoic.

Note that *níṣattam* reprises *níṣattā* in 2a, of Indra's mother.

In the 2nd hemistich Ge (et al.) once again tries to impose a subordinate clause (c) / main clause (d) structure, but once again runs into textual difficulties, because the verb in d (*ádadhā(ḥ))* is accented. Ge suggests, rather weakly, that it's accented because it's between two vocatives (n. 9cd); Old's account is similarly unsatisfactory. The syntactic solution seems to me obvious – to take d as part of the *yád* clause begun in c, with both of them subordinated to b. I further take *yád* as a neut. rel. prn. (not a subord. conjunction), with *tád* in b as its antecedent. The *yád* agrees with both *ū́dhaḥ* and *páyaḥ*.

With the syntax sorted out, we can turn to the sense. The assumption of Ge et al. seems to be that c depicts a bad situation that Indra remedies in d. Exactly what is supposed to be bad in c is not clear, and the fact that the lexeme *áti* √*sā* is otherwise unattested doesn't help (see Ge n. 9cd). I think rather that c and d are benefits conferred by Indra: he positioned the udder, presumably abounding in good things, on the earth and put milk in the cows and plants. All of this should/would seem good ("seem honey") "to him" (*asmai*), who must be a beneficiary of Indra's positive actions. The referent of *asmai* is probably the same as that of *asya* in pāda a. It could perhaps be Manu (see ad 7), though this is less likely for a than for b.

X.73.10: Note that Old makes no comment on this vs. – surely not because he found it crystal clear!

Leaving aside the content, the structure of this vs. is very challenging and may undercut my argument about *utá* in 9b, as it is difficult to interpret *utá* as a coordinating conjunction in pāda b (though see an attempt below). The most natural way to interpr. ab is with pāda a as a subordinate clause whose main clause is b, expressing two contrastive views of the source of Indra's birth, one held by unidentified 3rd pl. 'they', the other by me. This interpr. is reflected in

the publ. tr., with *utá* arbitrarily rendered as 'rather'. In a similar vein, JSK (DGRV I.447–48) suggests that here and in a few other passages "the scope of *utá* is limited to some constituent of its clause," here the person of the verb: 1st sg. *manye* versus 3rd pl. *vádanti*. He tr. "When they say, 'he has gone (forth) from the horse,' (then) I also (i.e. for my part) think him to be born from strength." The problem is that there are 752 occurrences of *utá* (per Lubotsky), and at best not even a handful of them need this "scope" interpr. This interpr. also leaves pāda c somewhat hanging: who holds that Indra came from battle-fervor – the "they" of a, the "I" of b, or some other entity or entities? Is c the *real* story of Indra's birth? Probably not, since d indicates that no one knows that but Indra. But the close parallelism between the expressions in a and c, ABL *iyāya*, carries no rhetorical weight in this interpr.

My tentative – and quite arbitrary – attempt to account for the *utá* and for the floating pāda c involves taking b as a parenthetical aside; c then is either what "they" really mean when they say he comes from a horse, or else an alternative, possibly the dominant view. In either case the obvious contrast between the phrases in a and c is properly exploited. I therefore suggest the alternative translations: "When they say 'he came from a horse' – and I think of him as born from strength – (they mean) 'he came from battle-fervor ...'" Or "While they say 'he came from a horse' – and I think of him as born from strength – he (really) came from battle-fervor ..."

The sense of *harmyéṣu tasthau* is also unclear. Ge (n. 10c) thinks that the jealous gods imprisoned Indra after his birth, but I see no evidence for this. I think rather that *harmyá-* refers to the womb. It is even possible that the beginning of d should be construed with this VP: "he stayed in a secure house (=womb), from which he came forth," with "Indra knows this" a separate clause.

In any case this vs. returns us to the 1st vs. of the hymn, indeed the first word: *jániṣṭhāḥ* 'you were born'. Since the final vs. (11) is a summary vs. detailing the requests of the poets, vss. 1 and 10 are conceptually ring compositional, but contrastively. It is striking that the beginning of the hymn focuses on Indra's *mother*'s role in his birth, whereas the various suggestions for Indra's origin in vs. 10 are either masc. ('horse', 'battle-fervor') or neut. ('strength'). There is also more certainty about the facts of the birth at the beginning than in this vs.

X.73.11: As just noted, this is a summary vs., unrelated in content to the rest of the hymn. This is also the only appearance of the Priyamedhas in X; they are more at home in VIII.

ūrṇuhí is accented because of its contrastive proximity to *pūrdhí*.

X.74 Indra

Although Ge suggests that the theme of the hymn is a plea for the dakṣiṇā, I see no evidence for this – nor for his previous view (registered and rejected by Old) that it celebrates a victory in racing.

X.74.1: This vs. provides an unusual number of disjunctive possibilities for objects and instruments of celebration: the vs. contains 5 occurrences of *vā* 'or'. Perhaps this wide range at the beginning makes the narrowing focus on Indra in the 2nd half of the hymn more pointed.

With Old (implicitly), I supply *sumnám* 'favor' as obj. of the part. *íyakṣan*, as in I.153.2, II.20.1, X.50.3. Ge (also Scar 557) instead makes the objects of praise (Vasus, world-halves, etc.) the objects of *íyakṣan* as well as of *carkṛṣe*. This is not impossible, but does require doubling the genitives with *carkṛṣe* with supplied accusatives to serve as objects of *íyakṣan*, which does not take the gen.

As Ge points out (n. 1b), *dhiyā́ vā yajñaír vā* is reprised in 3c by *dhíyaṃ ca yajñáṃ ca*.

The two pādas in the second hemistich are syntactically parallel: both contain *yé* rel. clauses with the genitive antecedent (complement of *carkṛṣe*) gapped and the nominal expression of it found as nom. pl. in the rel. clause "... pay tribute to (those), which steeds ...," etc. Needless to say, a literal rendering of these constructions produces non-parsable English.

(su)śrúṇa- is a hapax; such a *na*-stem is not otherwise found to √*śru*. It may have been created to split the difference between *vanúm* and *suśrútaḥ*.

X.74.2: With Ge I interpr. *háva* as loc. *háve*, against the Pp and Old. In favor of Old's analysis ("asurischer Ruf den Himmel erreichte") is 3a *iyám eṣām ... gī́ḥ*, with a nom. sg. of a verbal product plus dependent gen. *eṣām*. But I find *ásura-* as a qualifier of 'call' unlikely; it is the only such passage registered by Gr. The more likely subj. is Agni; see Ge's n. 2a for *dyā́m* √*naś /nakṣ* with Agni as subject and WE Hale (68–69) for Agni as *ásura-*. It is characteristic of Agni that his smoke (and flames) reach heaven while he spreads across the earth.

Of the three finite verbs in this vs., *nakṣata*, *niṃsata*, and *kṛnávanta*, the last one is an unambiguous subjunctive, and the second one is most likely subj. as well: though Gr classifies it under a them. *niṃsa-*, the few other forms to this (secondary) root are all athematic (as Gr recognizes): 3rd pl. *níṃsate*, part. *níṃsāna-*. (Wh Rts gives only a Class 2 pres.) By contrast *nakṣata* looks like the injunc. to the well-attested thematic stem *nákṣa-*, and this may well be so, since injunctives can mix with modal forms – though an *s*-aor. subjunctive to √*naś* can't be formally excluded.

On the semantics of √*niṃs* see comm. ad VIII.43.10.

Ge (fld by WE Hale, p. 69) takes *cákṣāṇā(ḥ)* as intrans. 'appearing', but med. *cáṣṭe* (etc.) overwhelmingly has the sense 'see', even when used absolutely without expressed object. In the publ. tr. I take the dat. *suvitā́ya* as what the gods are looking out for; it would also be possible to supply an acc. obj. like *víśvā*, as in IX.57.2 *víśvā cákṣāṇaḥ* "observing all," with the dat. serving as goal: "surveying (all things) for easy passage."

Ge's (and Hale's) interpr. are also unpersuasive because the simile in d is left hanging: "während die Götter ... es sich nach ihren eigenen Wünschen einrichten sollen wie der Himmel"; "while the gods ... will act by their own desires like the sky." Doing whatever it feels like is not a quality I associate with heaven; instead I think we have an incomplete simile, which lacks an instr. parallel to *vā́rebhiḥ ... svaíḥ*, which, however, is easily supplied: *stṛ́bhiḥ* 'with stars' (cf. for the full simile II.2.5, 34.2, IV.7.3). The use of the medial *kṛṇávanta* is idiomatic: 'make oneself (to be) with, provide oneself with'. The idea is that before their journey to the earth, the gods provide themselves with desirable things proper to themselves to distribute in return for sacrifice. The ritual reciprocity is described in the following vs. (3).

X.74.3: *kṛpáṇanta* echoes *kṛṇávanta* in 2d; it's worth noting that this is the only form built to this stem.

X.74.4: The verbal echoes continue, with *pananta* (pāda a) reading like a truncated form of *kṛpáṇanta* in 3b.

The vs. is notable for containing two desideratives in parallel rel. clauses with the same subject, one subjunctive (*títṛtsān* b) and one injunc. (*dudukṣan* d). It is not clear to me what the functional difference is between the two, and unfortunately Heenen (Le désidératif en védique) does not discuss the functions of modal forms to the desiderative or even list the relevant forms.

(For the latter see Avery, Verb Forms of the Rig-Veda 1268–70, and Macd, Vedic Gr. 389.) Unfortunately both omit the injunc. *dudukṣan*.) Of *títṛṭsān* Heenen says (149) that the verb "fait référence à un effort intense de volonté, suscité par l'émerveillemnt pour la récompense," but this reflects his usual ad hoc imposition of context on morphology (see my review: *JAOS* 128 [2008] 142–44). I do think that we must take the modal difference between the two verbs seriously: although, being pāda-final, there is no metrical difference between subj. *-ān* and injunc. *-an*, it is highly unlikely that redactors would have introduced the difference – much more likely that the two endings would have been secondarily harmonized. In trying to figure out what's going on, we are hampered by the fact that the role of the plural Āyus is not well defined. Gr considers the pl. to refer to men who are active in the service of the gods. Certainly almost all of the plural occurrences are found in specifically ritual situations, esp. the preparation of soma. Note in particular IX.62.20 *páyo duhanty āyávaḥ* "The Āyus milk the milk [=soma]," with the same root as here -- though this may be a red herring (see below).

My suggestions in what follows are extremely tentative. I start with the assumption that the desiderative subjunctive *títṛsān* expresses an action that the Āyus desire to perform that temporally and logically follows the action of the desiderative injunctive *dúdukṣan*, even though the rel. clauses are in the opposite order. I further assume that this logically sequential action is drilling into the Vala cave, "the enclosure full of cows" (*ūrváṃ gómantam*), to reach and acquire/free the cows. The logically prior *dudukṣan* must be what might enable them to do this: the milking of the great lofty (cow) with a thousand streams. As it happens, this cow is found elsewhere in the RV, esp. in two identical hemistichs: IV.41.5cd = X.101.9cd *sā́ no duhīyād yávaseva gatvī́, sahásradhārā páyasā mahī́ gaúḥ* "She should yield her milk to us like a great cow with her milk in a thousand streams who has gone to the pastures." (See also X.133.7d, which is identical to the other d pādas.) Who is this prodigious cow? In IV.41.5=X.101.9 it is quite clearly identified as the *dhī́*-, the inspired or visionary thought (IV.41.5b, X.101.9a) (in X.133.7 there is no referent, but *dhī́*- is certainly not excluded). I suggest that the milking of the *dhī́*- is at issue here as well: the Āyus must milk all the good out of their *dhī́*- in order to penetrate the Vala cave and reach the real (or at least real-er) cows. Note that *dhī́*- has occurred twice already in this hymn (1b, 3c); further the Āyus are elsewhere associated with ritual speech (I.117.25, 130.6, 131.2, 139.3; II.31.7; VIII.3.7–8). And of course the opening of the Vala cave was effected by speech and song, not by brute force. It is a nice touch that to reach the real cows the Āyus have to milk a metaphorical cow. For clarity I would now slightly rephrase the last three pādas of this vs. to "... -- they who will intend to drill through to the enclosure full of cows, who strive to milk the great (cow [= visionary thought]) ..."

It should be noted that the only other occurrence of *dudukṣan* (there unaccented) is in the devilish hymn X.61.10 also in a Vala context, where I take it to refer to the milking of the Vala cave itself (see comm. ad loc.), but not much can be made dependent on the interpr. of that hymn.

X.74.5: With Old (et al.), it is best to take *śácīva(ḥ)* as displaced from a voc. phrase *śácīva indra*, as in I.53.3. This voc. is overwhelming applied to Indra.

On *suvṛktí*- as a secondary bahuvr. applicable to gods who receive hymns, see comm. ad II.4.1. It modifies Indra in X.104.7.

X.74.6: There is some disagreement about several words in pāda a: the verb *vāvā́na* and the root-noun cmpd. *purāṣā́ṭ*. To start with the latter, though the standard view is that the cmpd. consists

of adverbial *purā* ‘earlier, previously’ (e.g., Gr, Scar 604), with the cmpd meaning ‘previously victorious’ vel sim., by contrast Ge, flg. Sāy., renders it ‘Burgenzwinger’, without providing a morphological analysis. Such an interpr. would require that the 2nd member be a preverb-verb combination *ā* √*sah*, which does not occur, with the root noun *pŭr-* ‘fortress’ as first member. Even if *ā* √*sah* did occur, root-noun cmpds don’t contain both a nominal 1st member and a preverb, as I’ve discussed elsewhere (Lamberterie Fs. 2020; in more detail in “Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian” [Kellens Fs. 2024]). If the 2nd member is only *ṣāh-*, then the 1st member would have to be a case form of *pŭr-*, but the instr. doesn’t work semantically and there are no other possibilities. I like ‘previous victor’ vel sim. for another reason: it contrasts nicely with *purutámam*. Although most interpr. take the latter as adverbial (Ge, Scar “am haüfigsten”), if we take the *-tama*-suffix as expressing not a superlative but the last of a series (as is common), Indra is identified as a victor both long ago and right this minute.

As for *vāvāna*, in contrast to the near-universal interpr. as the pf. to √*van* ‘win’, Kü (448–49) assigns it instead to √*van*^{i} ‘love’, for complex reasons that I will not rehearse because I find them implausible.

Note the return of the expression “fulfill his names,” as in the previous hymn X.73.8.

X.75–76: The Anukramaṇī attributes these two hymns to different poets, Sindhukṣit Praiyamedha and Jaratkarṇa Airāvata respectively. The contents of the two hymns are also quite distinct. Nonetheless, it is best to follow Old (Prol. 236 n. 3) in assuming the two hymns belong together, since they are found in the midst of the series of dyads (X.61–84).

X.75 Rivers

The first few vss. are dominated by the preverb *prá* ‘forth’: pāda-initial in 1a, c, d, 2a, internal in 2c, 3c).

The pattern of names in this hymn may sketch an omphalos structure: the middle verses (5–6) contain an extravagance of river names, barely held together by minimal syntactic frames, whereas the verses before (1–4) and after (7–9) contain only Sindhu, once per verse.

X.75.1: There is much disc. of the numerical phrase *saptá-sapta tredhā*. In addition to Ge and Re, see Lü (684–86), Mau (203–4), also Kü (146). Mau’s disc. seems the most sensible: he thinks we’re dealing with three geographical groupings consisting of (roughly) seven rivers apiece, rather than a straight multiplicative 3 x 7. The number of rivers named in vss. 5–6 is eighteen (by my count) – close enough to seven groups of three. For a similar expression used of the river Sarasvatī see VI.61.12 *triṣadhásthā saptádhātuḥ*.

I do not understand the placement of *hí* in c.

Ge (n. 1d) suggests supplying *sasre* in d. Given the repetition of *prá*, I prefer to continue with a form of √*kram* as in c (*prá ... cakramúḥ*).

X.75.2: The gen. pl. phrase *eṣām ... jágatām* is interpr. by all as referring to the rivers (e.g., Re “... de ces (rivières) mobiles”), and this is quite plausible, esp. given 1d. However, ‘river’ is of course fem., and adjectives modifying the rivers should be fem. too (like *sṛ́tvarīṇām* in 1d). But *eṣām* identifies the phrase as masc.; the contrast between *eṣām ágram* here and fem. *āsām ágram* in 4d is quite pointed. I’m afraid we must take *jágat-* as a quasi-masc. substantive here, though it does presumably refer to the rivers.

X.75.3: On *bhū́myā* as instr., *pace* Pp., Gr, see Old.

Apropos of *śúṣmam* in b, In VI.61.2 the river Sarasvatī is compared to "a root-grubbing (boar) with its snortings" (*śúṣmebhir bisakhā́ iva*); see comm. ad loc.

I read *vṛṣṭáyaḥ* both with the simile, as "real" rain, and with the frame, as the spray from the rushing river. "The rains thunder" is a type of synaesthesia or, at any rate, the conflation of two separate phenomena related to a single event: rain and thunder associated with a storm. Re's "Les pluies (pleuvent) comme (les tonnerres) tonnent" sorts the two phenomana into separate, more logical categories – losing the concentrated poetic focus. Moreover, his rendering is grammatically impossible, as RVic similes always share the same verb.

X.75.4: Note that vs.-initial #*abhí tvā* slightly echoes 3c #*abhrā́d iva*

The first hemistich presents Sindhu as a helpless calf to whom the motherly cows flock. This might seem like a reversal of the depiction of the power and dominance of Sindhu over the other rivers (1d, 2d), but of course the other rivers are bringing their "milk" to contribute to her strengthening stream.

If there was even a moment of doubt about her dominance, it is dispelled by the second hemistich, with Sindhu as a "battling king" (*rā́jeva yúdhvā*).

X.75.5–6: These vss. enumerate the names of rivers. As indicated in the publ. intro., much has been made of this list for the geography of NW India, and I refer the reader to such discussions, e.g., that of Mau.

X.75.8: The two hapaxes *sīlámā(-vatī)* and *madhuvṛ́dh-* are plausibly taken as plant names. (For the latter see Scar 521.)

X.75.9: The referent of the genitive phrase in cd, *asya ... ádabdhasya sváyaśaso virapśínaḥ*, is unclear, but the most obvious and desirable referent, Sindhu herself, is excluded by the gender, which must be masc. or neut. This leaves the chariot (*rátha-*), the prize (*vā́ja-*), or the contest (*āji-*). Ge, Re, and Mau opt for the chariot, though in his n. Re allows the possibility that it is Sindhu "concu(e) comme masc." Old is of the same opinion, based on the implicit comparison of Sindhu to a Wettfahrer in ab. I am reluctant to go this direction because of the stress laid on the grammatical gender of 'river' words, esp. emphasized for Sindhu in vss. 7–8.

X.76 Pressing Stones

It is totally unclear to me why this hymn is attributed to a snake (*sarpa*), much less why this snake is called "Having old ears." As MM (PN s.v. *járatkarṇa-*) points out, the phrase *járataḥ kárṇa-*) is found in nearby X.80.3 as a personal name, but the connection is not straightforward.

X.76.1: On *ṛñjase* see comm. ad IV.8.1. The form expresses an act of reverence, several times in the form of a hymn (*girā́* IV.8.1, VI.15.1).

The expression *ūrjā́m vyùṣṭisu*, assuming the two words go together (as most do, incl. Caland-Henry p. 271, but notably not Ge), is at first glance somewhat bizarre: "at the first dawn flushes of nourishment(s)" (in the publ. tr. I suppressed the pl. of *ūrjā́m*). But I think it economically combines two different concepts. On the one hand, like "the milk of the dawn cows," it refers to the visual effect of dawn: the milky white sky at the horizon just before

sunrise. On the other hand, the appearance of the dawn inaugurates the soma pressing, that is, the production of nourishment, and so the pressing stones need to be deployed. Ge prefers to construe *ūrjā́m* with (*ā́ ...*) *ṛñjase*, ("ich begehre eurer Kräfte"), but *ṛñjase* does not take a genitive elsewhere (and it does not mean 'desire').

I take *udbhídā* as referring to what in English is also called day-*break*.

It's not entirely clear what "make every seat spacious" is meant to convey, but I assume that, with the coming of daylight, places appear larger. The particular seats in question may be the ritual ground and its parts.

X.76.2: This vs. provides ample puzzles, though the straightforward first pāda gives no hint of what is to come.

The first issue is *sotári* in b. This appears to be the loc. sg. of the well-attested agent noun *sotár-* '(soma-)presser', and that is how I take it (also in its other occurrence in X.100.9). But this is a minority view, at least as to function. Ge (n. 2b) cites Ludwig's view that it is a nom. sg., while Ge himself suggests it might be an infinitive (which he glosses as a functional imperative/modal "soll pressen"); Re follows suit by pronouncing it a hortatory infinitive. Tichy, by contrast, considers the locc. in *-tári* as verbal abstracts, here "beim Somapressen." My interpr. starts with the simile *átyo ná hástayataḥ* "like a steed controlled by the hands." The stone (*ádriḥ*) is compared to the steed, and, in my opinion, the soma-presser is compared to the hand(s), the first member of the cmpd., the controller of the steed – as often, we have a cmpd. corresponding to a free syntagm. Caland-Henry's rendering, "comme un cheval tenu en main [est] le Pierre pour le pressureur," is closest to mine.

One of the questions posed by the 2nd hemistich is the identity/-ties of the subjects of *vidát* (c) and *tarute* (d), but before tackling that we must figure out how to construe d. Despite the glaring absence of accent on *tarute*, the standard tr. take d as a subord. clause controlled by *yád.* The accent problem is rather casually waved away, even by Old. I am quite unwilling to ignore the lack of accent, and therefore interpr. *yád árvataḥ* as a nominal rel. cl. of the type frequent at the ends of sentences/verse lines (see my Fs. Hale paper). The antecedent of *yád* is *paúṃsyam*, the obj. of *vidát* and gapped obj. of *taruṣe*. The subj. of *vidát* is the stone, that of *tarute* the presser, who attains the power that the stone found by virtue of his (presser's) wielding of the stone. Figuring out what to do with *tarute* is complicated by the fact that it is the only form to this stem (anywhere) and the only middle form of √*tṝ* without a preverb (save for *taruṣanta* in I.132.5, which is an *-anta* replacement).

On *mahó rāyé* see comm. ad IV.31.11.

The publ. tr. misleadingly renders both *átya-* (b) and *árvant-* (d) as 'steed', implying that the same word is used in both places. Both are marked words, in contrast to *áśva-* -- as 'steed' is in English – but I would now substitute 'charger' (another marked word) for the second.

X.76.3: The opening of this vs., *tád íd dhy àsya sávanam ...*, is a kind of mash-up of the 2a *tád u* x x x *sávanam ...* and 2c *vidád dhí* with flip of vowels in the latter. These echoes may underline the fact that 3 continues the theme of 2.

Pāda a presents several problems. One is accentual: *apáḥ*, so accented, should be the acc. pl. of *áp-* 'water(s)'; the same phrase, *vivér apáḥ*, is also found in X.147.1. In both cases, the form is better taken as the wrongly accented neut. sg. **ápaḥ* 'work'; so interpr. by Sāy (with gloss *karma*), Ge, and Old. This interpr. is supported by the same phrase with neut. pl. *vivér ápāṃsi* (I.69.8 and VI.31.3) showing the expected accent. By contrast, Caland-Henry (271) tr.

apáḥ as 'waters', and Lub seems to accept 'waters' not only for this passage and X.147.1 but also for I.69.8 and VI.31.3, judging from the ! that he uses to mark those occurrences of *ápāṃsi*.

Another question is the morphological identity and syntactic function of *sávanam*. With Sāy. and Old, I take it as acc., a parallel object to **ápaḥ*; the subject is then the stone. As Old points out, the pressing stones are associated with *ápas-* in vss. 5 and 8. However, Ge takes *sávanam* as the subject, referring not to the action of pressing but its result, the Trankspende; this doesn't make a lot of sense to me: in what way has the oblation accomplished its work?

Finally, what is the referent of *asya*? For Ge (n. 3a) it is Indra, who was indeed mentioned in 1b; I think rather the stone, with (explicitly) Sāy. and (implicitly) Old. Although by this interpr. *asya* is coreferential with the subject, a reflexive is not required under these circumstances – anymore than in the Engl. tr. "it has labored ... at its task." As this tr. shows, I think *asya* is actually dependent on **ápaḥ*, not adjacent *sávanam*; the enclitic *asya* is taking modified 2nd position after *tád* plus the complex of particles *íd dhí*.

Having dealt with pāda a, we must determine how the rest of the vs. fits together, and once again there are competing views. Ge (n. 3c) takes b as a parenthetical intrusion, with c continuing pāda a and d a separate sentence. Caland-Henry take b with a, with cd belonging together; this seems to be the implicit assumption of Kü (527), in that he tr. cd as a single clause and ignores the first hemistich. My interpr. departs from all these and begins with the fact that the *yáthā* clause of b contains the root aor. *áśret*, which is echoed by the main verb in d, the pf. *aśiśrayuḥ*. Although Re explicit states that the two verbs have entirely different senses (without saying what he thinks they are), the root agreement between the two verbs strongly invites an interpr. with *yáthā purā́* "just as previously ..." serving as long-ago model and exemplar for the main clause, which expresses action of the more recent past.

The phrase *mánave gātúm* VERB several times has Indra as subj. (V.30.7, X.49.9; once Aśvins I.112.16), and so it seems reasonable to supply Indra as the mythological subject here. It also seems reasonable to attach c to the subordinate clauses in b, with the main clause constituting d. Not only does the mention of Tvaṣṭar in c locate it in the realm of mythology, but syntactically d "presents" as a new clause, with the preverb *prá* in tmesis, followed by an enclitic particle/pronoun *īm*, doubling the obj. *adhvarā́n*.

What then does pāda c add to the mythological picture begun in c? Here we need to determine whether the vṛddhi derivative *tvāṣṭrá-* refers to anything associated with the god Tvaṣṭar or specifically to Tvaṣṭar's son, Viśvarūpa. The other occurrences of this stem can refer to either one, but with a decided preference for the latter: in I.117.22 it's Tvaṣṭar's honey (*mádhu*), possibly soma, but in the remaining clear passages, II.11.19, X.8.8, 9 [that is, leaving aside III.7.4], Viśvarūpa is the referent and his defeat and the loss of his cows the topic. In our passage I now think either is possible – and neither is particularly compelling. In the publ. tr. I supply 'wealth' as the referent of *tvāṣṭré*, in part because one of the other adjectives in this NP, *góarṇas-* modifies *rayí-* in X.38.2. In this interpr. the loc. phrase serves as the goal of Manu's course in b. It could also be a loc. absolute: "when Tvaṣṭar's (wealth) (was at issue)." If *tvāṣṭré* here refers specifically to Tvaṣṭar's hapless son, the phrase again could either be a goal or a locative absolute: "... course to Tvaṣṭar's son, who had a flood of cows and a raiment of horses" or "when T's son ... (was at issue)." Unfortunately I know of no tale involving Manu and Tvaṣṭar's wealth or son, and so there is no easy (or indeed hard) way to make a decision – except in one particular: the loc. goal is somewhat favored over the loc. absol., because the main clause verb (*prá ...*) *aśiśrayuḥ* also takes a loc., which is unlikely to be in absolute function.

It also has to be admitted that the main clause of d provides no help at all. Though I stand by the argument that the two verbal forms of √*śri* in b and d impose the structure laid out above, it is difficult to see how bc provides a model or comparandum for d. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that the main clause verb seems to be construed with *prá* in tmesis, but there are no other exx. of *prá* √*śri* in the RV [in I.149.2, cited by VB, the *prá* belongs rather with the participle to √*sṛ*], and the only one anywhere else in Vedic is found in a single passage in KS (XXVI.3), which contributes nothing. My feeling is that in our passage *prá* doesn't do much work, though perhaps a tr. "set forth ceremonies upon ceremonies" would at least register its presence. Another issue about the perfect is that it's plural, but there's no likely plural subject in the immediate vicinity. I think it likely that it's the pressing stones, who get directly addressed, in the plural, in the next vs. Perhaps the point of all of this is that just as Indra set Manu on the course to acquire Tvaṣṭar's wealth or Tvaṣṭar's son, so it's the pressing stones that set the ritual cursus at sacrifice after sacrifice. The exhortations to the stones in the next vs. may delineate what their relevant actions should be. But this is all very tentative and unsatisfactory.

X.76.4: On *bhaṅgurā́vant-* see comm. ad VII.104.7.

In c *sunotana* reprises the same impv. in 2a.

"Carry a tune" for *bharata ślókam* is my playful and not entirely literal rendering, which I found impossible to resist. For the sense of *ślóka-* see comm. ad I.51.12, IX.92.1 (the latter with regard to the pressing stones' role). The point here is that the stones are so noisy that the sound will reach heaven as a signal to the gods that the soma is ready.

X.76.5: The rigid, four-square pāda structure with a pāda-final comparative in the dat. pl. and a pāda-initial standard of comparison in the ablative (a, c, d), marked by *cid (ā́)*, should impose an ablative interpretation on *vibhvánā*, and indeed a number of comm. (see Old) suggest emending to **vibhvánaś*. However, as Old asks, how would such a corruption have arisen? He opts for taking it as a "comparative instrumental," which is a fine description but is not a standard syntactic category as far as I know. I do not have a better solution, however. It is worth noting that the stem to which it belongs is somewhat problematic. It has two different accents: initial *víbhvan-* in well-attested nom. sg. *víbhvā* and suffix accent only in this form and the (infinitival?) dat. *vibhváne* (VI.61.13, where, it might be noted, it's found in the same vs. as the superlative *apástama-* 'busiest'). The stem is also used in two different senses, as an adj. 'wide-ranging' and/or 'distinguished' and as the PN of one of the Ṛbhus. In this passage the latter seems the default interpr. (see the standard tr., incl. Caland-Henry and the publ. tr.), given the names in the other three pādas and the fact that *apás-* 'industrious' several times modifies the craftsmen Ṛbhus (III.60.3, IV.33.1, maybe V.42.12). It is possible, however, that *vibhvánā* here should also be read in its general sense and with an instr. function "by (your) distinction." But I suggest this only very tentatively.

Another way in which b deviates from the surrounding pādas is the apparent lack of *ā́*: both a and c begin ABL *cid ā́*, but though b has a long *ā* flg. *cid*, it is unaccented and belongs to the 1st cmpd member *āśú-*. It would be possible to argue that the accent was removed redactionally, but I think it more likely that it's another way in which b is marked out as different. The *ā́* is also missing from d, where an *a*-vowel follows *cid*, but a short one: *agnéś cid a[rca]*.

arca is also somewhat problematic. It is, of course, on the surface a straightforward 2nd sg. impv. However, it coexists, a bit uneasily, with the 2nd pl. enclitic *vaḥ* in pāda a, referring to

the pressing stones -- giving two 2nd ps. with different referents in a single clause. Therefore a number of interpr. (Ge, Caland-Henry, etc.) silently or explicitly emend to 1st sg. subj. **arcā* "I shall sing / let me sing." Metrically this would be acceptable, and the mechanism is easy to see: since 2nd sg. impvs. frequently lengthen their final *-a*, coinciding with the 1sg sg. subj. ending *-ā*, a backformation of the latter to short *-a* would be unexceptionable. However, this reanalysis is unnecessary: poets frequently exhort themselves, in the 2nd sg., to praise or perform other ritual acts, and these exhortations can co-occur with 2nd plurals referring to others, often the poet's ritual colleagues – as the pressing stones are here. See my 2005 "Poetic Self-reference" (Fs. Skjaervø). Old also resists the 1st sg. interpr.

X.76.6: Yet again, this vs. poses some niggling grammatical problems, the most serious of which is *sótu* in pāda a. This appears to be a 3rd singular root aor. impv. to √*su* 'press', which is how Gr classifies it (though with an alternative suggested; see below) and the publ. tr. renders it. However, it follows a 3rd plural impv. (*bhurantu*), whose subj. (*grā́vāṇaḥ*) is continued in b. In other words, if *sótu* is a singular impv. it has to be parenthetical (as in the publ. tr.). I still subscribe to this interpr. In its favor I will point out two factors: 1) references to plural stones alternate with singular ones in this hymn; see esp. 2a with pl. impv. *sunotana*, fld. by 2b with a single stone (*ádriḥ*) (and if I'm right, also 2cd and 3a; then 3d, 4 with pl. stones). 2) the 3rd plural impv. of the root aor., to correspond to preceding 3rd pl. *bhurántu*, would be **svántu*, almost surely undistracted (cf. the overwhelmingly undistracted med. root aor. part. *svāná-*), which is unattested and, if found, would lose the distinctive root syllable of this root. I think this form would be avoided, and the 3rd sg. would provide a robust substitute (with root syll. *so-*).

However, I seem to be alone in this interpr., so I will briefly consider the alternatives that have been suggested. Old's is the one that requires the least machinery, but it is unlikely for two reasons. After flirting with *sótu* as a loc. he takes it as a neut. acc. *-tu-* stem (presumably meaning 'soma-pressing'), which serves as obj. to *bhurántu* (apparently partially fld. by Scar 44–45, 186). However, as Re also points out, *bhurá-* (and related stems) is otherwise intrans. Moreover, a masc. acc. *sótum* is attested (VIII.19.18) with the same apparent meaning, and it is not exactly parsimonious to posit an identical stem but two different genders, each attested only once – esp. since masc. acc. **sótum* would neatly avoid hiatus here. Gr in fact suggests emending to **sótum*, and Ge seems to follow this suggestion (without explicit note), but rendering it as an infinitive "um uns Saft auszuschlagen." This infinitival stem is attested elsewhere, as dat. *sótave* (I.28.1) and abl. *sótos* (X.86.1). The *-tum* infinitive, so characteristic of later Skt., is of course quite rare in the RV, but in this relatively late portion of the text it is certainly thinkable. If the 3rd sg. impv. interpr. is rejected, I would favor the infinitive above the others, tr. "Let the glorious ones clatter for us, to press (soma) out of the stalk." But this still requires emendation, whereas the impv. interpr. does not.

I take *ándhasaḥ* as an abl. of source ("out of the stalk") rather than partitive gen. obj. ("press of the sap/soma"). On the meaning of *ándhas-* see comm. ad IV.1.19.

On *divít(mant)-* see comm. ad IV.31.11; unsuffixed *divít-* occurs only here, *divít-mant-* only 4x. The *-mant-*suffix seems pleonastic, so a satisfactory and semi-literal tr. is hard to achieve – perhaps "with their heaven-bound voice going to heaven."

As noted in the publ. intro., I take *náraḥ* in c (and in 7d) to refer to the pressing stones, not human ritualists, since the voc. *naraḥ* in 8a must be addressed to the stones. Among other things, this saves us from taking c here as parenthetic, as Ge does, since he recognizes that d must have the stones as subj. (n. 6d).

I supply "heaven and earth" as obj. to *āghoṣáyantaḥ* 'causing to heed', on the basis of passages in the other principal pressing stone hymn: X.94.4 *āghoṣáyantaḥ pṛthivī́m* "making earth heed," as well X.94.12 *ā́ dyā́ṃ ráveṇa pṛthivī́m aśuśravuḥ* "they have made Heaven and Earth listen by their bellowing."

On *mithas-túr-* see Scar (186).

X.76.7: The stem *rathirá-* ordinarily modifies gods, and the usual gloss 'charioteer' (Gr Wagenlenker) fits those contexts. However, in VIII.50.8 (Vālakh.) it qualifies horses (*hárayaḥ*), and 'fit for the chariot' or sim. seems a better rendering. In our passage, too, I would now substitute 'fit for the chariot, chariot-broken' for 'charioteers', on the basis of 2b, where the stone is compared to the steed controlled by the hand of the charioteer.

With Ge (and Re, Scar 55) I take *gavíṣaḥ* as gen. sg. (with *asya*), not nom. pl. (with Sāy., Gr, Caland-Henry, Ob II.46). The referent of the gen. phrase in b, *asya ... gavíṣaḥ* "of him/the one seeking the cows," is of course soma, which always seeks mixture with cows' milk. It is possible, however, that *gavíṣaḥ* could <u>also</u> be read as nom. pl., modifying the stones that are "milking" out the juice.

The simile in d is puzzling. Given the position of *ná*, it should signal that the simile is limited to *havyā́* (so "the men groom [X] like oblations"), but this doesn't make a lot of sense: the milked-out soma *is* the oblation. Nonetheless, this is the interpr. in the publ. tr. Ge silently flips the *ná*, taking it with *náraḥ* (and does not include *havyā́* in the simile): "Wie die Herren machen sie das Opfer mit ihren Mäulen sauber." So also Scar (55), though with a long, puzzled note (n. 68) on the problems with the simile. Although this is an easy solution, I don't think it is the correct one. For one thing, the stones have already been identified as *náraḥ* (6c) and will almost immediately be addressed as such (8a); they are not <u>like</u> men, <u>but</u> men. For another, there is no metrical or other barrier to the proper positioning of *ná* for such a meaning: *náro *ná havyā́* is, if anything, metrically better than the transmitted text (see Arnold's statistics on the rhythm of the opening, p. 188). I reluctantly conclude that this may be one of the few occasions in the RV where the simile particle should be taken with the verb: "they, as it were, groom ..."

X.76.8: The publ. tr. takes the two parallel nominal clauses in the 2nd hemistich as statements of fact; Ge by contrast supplies a modal "sei." This is possible but not necessary.

X.77–78: These two hymns are attributed to Syūmaraśmi Bhārgava and dedicated to the Maruts. They are also unified by an unusual metrical scheme and a tightly controlled stylistic reliance on similes. For both of these features see the publ. intros. to the two hymns; for the meter esp. see Old, Prol. 92ff., as well as the intro. to X.77 in the Noten.

X.77 Maruts

As noted in the published introduction, this hymn falls into two distinct parts (1–5. 6–8), defined by meter and style. On the meter see the publ. intro. to X.77–78. The first part is crammed with elaborate similes, which are entirely absent from the second. It is also noteworthy that in the first part the Maruts do not appear by name, except in the thematized vṛddhied bahuvrīhi *sumā́ruta-* (1c, 2b) in the acc. sg., modifying *bráhman-*, who is in this case probably Indra (see below), whereas forms of the pl. stem *marút-* are prominent in 6a and 7b.

X.77.1: A dense vs. We can start with the root noun cmpd *abhraprúṣaḥ* and its etymologically twinned verb *pruṣā*. Both of these forms are morphologically ambiguous: the former can be nom. pl., acc. pl., or abl.-gen. sg., the latter 2nd sg. impv. or 1st sg. subjunctive. On the basis of *astoṣi* in d I opt for the subjunctive, and, for the cmpd., for the nom. pl., to allow the referents of the cmpd. to be directly compared with the subject of *pruṣā*. (These are generally the choices made by other interpr., though the Pp. reads short-vowel *pruṣa*, hence the impv.)

The next question is the relation between the cmpd members in *abhra-prúṣ-*. (For disc. see Scar 342.) An acc. relation is possible; so Re "... qui font-fuser la nuée." But I favor an ablative, like *abhrā́t* in c and, closer in sense, the phrase in nearby X.75.3 *abhrā́d iva ... vṛṣṭáyaḥ* 'like rains from the clouds." Here as well I supply 'rain' as the suppressed object of *-prúṣa-*, parallel to the 'goods' (*vásu*) that I, the poet, shower down. The referents of *abhraprúṣaḥ* are surely the Maruts, the dedicands of this hymn, who thus appear, disguised, in its first word. It is a nice touch that the poet compares himself with the very gods he is also praising.

I read *vācā́* with both simile and frame. In the frame, of course, it refers to the poet's speech, but in the simile it can refer to thunder, the Maruts' speech (cf. I.168.8 [Maruts] *abhríyāṃ vā́cam* "speech stemming from a cloud"). Scar (342 n. 481) also mentions the 'thunder' possibility but stops short of reading *vācā́* twice.

Pāda b contains the morphologically aberrant gen. sg. *vijānúṣaḥ*. The standard explan. of this form (see, e.g., Old with reff., AiG II.2.910, more recently Kü 203–4, Lowe [Part. 25, 252]) must be correct: that it is a contamination/blend of the pf. participle of √*jñā* (expected weak form **jajñ-úṣ-*) and the 9th cl. pres. part. (expected weak form **jān-át-*). The reason for this blend is not apparent, since the gen. sg. of either stem would fit metrically and should have been morphologically transparent.

The poet is the referent of this gen., and the point of the pāda is that *his* sacrifices, which consist of well-wrought words are just as good as those that consist of physical oblations. There may be a slight asymmetry of expression here. On the surface *havíṣmantaḥ* in the simile of course modifies *yajñā́ḥ*, which participates in both simile and frame, with the meaning "(like) sacrifices consisting of oblations," but in fact well-attested *havíṣmant-* generally modifies the ritualists who provide oblations, rather than the sacrifice that consists of them. We might almost have expected gen. **havíṣmataḥ*, parallel to *vijānúṣaḥ*, with the sense "The sacrifices of a discerning one are like (those) *of one who provides oblations." I do not suggest emendation; instead I think the poet is keeping his audience off balance and confounding their expectations.

The syntax and constituency of cd are multiply ambiguous and interpr. in multiple ways: see the very different treatments of Old (at some length), Ge, and Re. I will not examine their versions in detail. As for mine, there are several structural clues that may help to sort out the competing possibilities. First, the dat. *-áse* forms that end each pāda (c *arháse*, d *śobháse*) seem meant to be parallel, though a number of interpr. deploy them differently. Second, given their localization in different pādas, the accusatives of c (*sumā́rutaṃ (ná) brahmā́ṇam*) and d (*gánam*) should be kept separate, with the phrase in c being compared to that in d. Again, this is not the universal view.

Pāda d is straightforward, with the 1st sg. *astoṣi* "I have praised," with *gáṇam ... eṣām* "the flock of them," referring to the Maruts, as obj. The dat. *śobháse* 'for beauty' belongs to a root, √*śubh*, that is characteristic of the Maruts. See esp. the similar use of the root noun dat. *śubhé* in Śyāvāśva's Marut hymns (V.52.8, 57.3, 63.5,6), also *śubhaṃyú-* in the next hymn, X.78.7. Despite the position of *ná*, I think it marks *śobháse* as the simile, compared to *arháse* in c. As discussed elsewhere (see, e.g., comm. ad X.21.1 and now my 2024 ECIEC paper

"Penultimate *ná* 'like' in the RV: A Syntactic Archaism," to appear in a forthcoming Fs.), simile-marking *ná* is blocked from pāda-final position and flips with its target if it would take that position.

This now leaves pāda c. Since, per my structural analysis, the acc. phrase in this pāda cannot be identical to that in d (*pace* Re) and it should not be the obj. of *arháse* (*pace* Ge), we need to identify a referent for *sumā́rutam ... brahmā́ṇam* different from the Marut flock in d. Taking *sumā́ruta-* as adj. with *brahmán-* (*pace* Old, who claims it has to be a noun) points to an obvious referent: Indra, who is, of course, often accompanied by the Maruts (*marútvant-* being one of his standing epithets). And Indra, in his role as *bṛ́haspáti-*, is closely associated with the formulation and indeed called *brahmán-* directly (e.g., VIII.16.7).

Now *arháse* – who is deserving, and deserving of what? Re takes it as passive; Ge's interpr. I don't understand, and it is informed by his somewhat peculiar view that this is all about weather; Old takes *sumā́rutam* as its obj. ("damit er Anspruch habe auf schöne Marutgnade") and *brahmā́ṇam* as its subj. I supply soma as the obj., because the soma drink is the most common obj. of √*arh* (see comm. ad VIII.20.18). I am not entirely happy with this intrusion, but it might make sense of comparing the Marut flock with Indra: they both deserve the soma, but Indra especially.

X.77.2: The dat. *śriyé* that opens the vs. picks up the *śobháse* that ends vs. 1. Both are common elements in the Marut lexicon; for *śriyé* see, e.g., V.55.3, 60.4.

The problematic pāda is b, which contains *sumā́rutam* like 1c. There is no consensus about its usage here, or even its case form. Re takes it as a neut. nom., collectively referring to the pl. subject *máryāsaḥ* ("en tant que bonne troupe mârutienne"), while Ge takes it as acc. referring to "ihr schönes Marutwetter." My interpr. differs significantly from these, and depends on three factors: I take *sumā́rutam* as acc. and supply *brahmā́ṇam* from the phrase in 1c *sumā́rutaṃ ná brahmā́ṇam*; I take the verb *akṛṇvata* in pāda a as controlling a kind of śleṣa, where *sumā́rutaṃ ná* is structurally compared to *añjī́n*, though they have somewhat different relationships to the verb; I take *pūrvī́r áti kṣápaḥ* with the phrase in c, not the simile in d. In c the obj. *añjī́n* denotes what the Maruts made/provided for themselves – ornaments -- appropriate to the middle voice of *akṛṇvata*. The phrase *pūrvī́r áti kṣápaḥ* "across the many nights" is also appropriate here, because the 'ornaments, unguents' they make for themselves are elsewhere compared to stars. See, e.g, I.87.1 1 ... *añjíbhir, vyā́najre ké cid usrā́ iva stṛ́bhiḥ* "with their unguents [the Maruts] have anointed themselves ... like the ruddy (dawns) with stars," In the simile in d *sumā́rutam* is a predicate adj. modifying the gapped *brahmā́nam*: "(as) they have made (the formulator) well-provided with Maruts." This latter usage is rather like III.11 4 *agním ... váhniṃ devā́ akṛ̥ṇvata* "The gods made Agni their oblation-conveyor." My interpr. of this hemistich is not particularly secure, but I think it is better than the other ones available.

On the curious intrusion of the Ādityas, see the publ. intro. I have no explanation; I am somewhat dubious about Th's view (Fremd. 158) that what the Maruts and the Ādityas have in common is their care for the stranger (expressed by the epithet *riśā́das-* of disputed meaning [see comm. ad I.2.7, V.60.7] in 3d and 5c). In any case, the word order, with *té*, ordinarily a first-position pronoun, following *ādityā́saḥ*, seems to me to signal that *ādityā́saḥ* is an unmarked simile.

On *akrá-* see comm. ad I.189.7.

X.77.3: The first pāda of this vs. departs from the already aberrant meter of this part of the hymn: rather than having an opening of 5 ending with a light syllable, followed by a heavy syllable that can count as two lights (see disc. in publ. intro.) allowing a Jagatī cadence, this has an opening of 4. However, the 5th syllable is light and the heavy 6th syllable can "count" as two lights, as elsewhere in this little group. The other 3 pādas conform to the meter elsewhere in these vss., with an opening of 5.

The *ná* in pāda a does not seem to be doing real simile work, since it seems unlikely that earth is being compared to heaven: they usually form a pair. My "as beyond earth" renders the *ná* unobtrusively and not very convincingly. It is quite possible that it's marking pāda-final *barháṇā* as the simile, with the same flip as in 1d, but "as if by might" seems to belittle the Maruts' power.

In c #*pā́jasvanto ... panasyávo*# echo each other, further taken up by #*práyasvanto* in 4d.

X.77.4: The first two pādas diverge from the metrical template of this part of the hymn in a different way from 3a: they have light 6th syllables. It is also a challenging vs. in structure and content.

In pāda a I take the gen. *yuṣmā́kam* with *yā́mani* and the gen. *apā́m* with *budhné*, with Old and Re (though not, with the latter, introducing Ahi Budhnya into an already crowded vs.). I also take the simile as consisting of *budhné apā́ṃ ná* despite the position of *ná*. (As we have seen and will see, the position of *ná* in this hymn can be all over the map.) The point of this first hemistich is that the earth (*mahī́*) trembles at the Maruts' journey, a common image in Marut hymns. In my interpr. the simile in the first pāda compares the earth to something based on water – that is, without a solid base.

Pāda b contains two verbs of parallel formation and near-identical sense, #*vithuryáti* 'wavers, falters' and *śratharyáti*# 'slackens'. Both are hapaxes, but the former is clearly based on the reasonably well-attested adj. *vithurá-* 'wavering', while *śratharyá-* has no associated *r*-form, **śrathara-* or the like, and must be directly based on *vithuryáti*. So also Re, though he cleverly also adduces *śithirá-*, also with *-r-*, as a near-relative. I assume that the accent of *śratharyáti* was also adapted from *vithuryáti*, as there is no syntactic reason for this verb to be accented. For *vithurá-* in this exact context, see I.87.3 [Maruts] *praíṣām ájmeṣu vithuréva rejate, bhū́mir yā́meṣu ...* "At their drives, their journeys the earth trembles like one with faltering step" (sim. I.168.6, also Maruts).

The second hemistich is oddly constructed. In c we find a pāda-internal deictic pronoun followed by a Wackernagel particle chain: ... *ayáṃ sú vaḥ*#. This is unprecedented as far as I can tell: *ayám* (etc.) is overwhelmingly pāda (/clause) initial; the few non-initial forms are generally preceded by at most one item, and I have found no other exx. where a mid-pāda *ayám* supports a clitic chain. The referent of *ayám* here is clearly the nom. phrase that precedes it: *viśvápsur yajñó arvā́k*. Because of the unusual configuration of *ayám*, in the publ. tr. I took it as introducing a new clause, which continues into d. I now think this is wrong; certainly my English tr. is scarcely parsable. I now think that c is a self-contained nominal cl. with a heavy left-dislocated NP: "the sacrifice close by consisting of all good things -- this is for you." The simile that opens d, *práyasvanto ná*, then qualifies the unexpressed subj. of the impv. *ā́ gata*, the Maruts: "Like dispensers of ritual delight, come here to those who are concentrated (on you)."

On the adj. *viśvápsu-* see comm. ad I.148.1. Th's 'breath' interpr. (see KlSch 74f.) "ganz aus Atemhauch bestehend," which is also responsible for Re's "consistant entièrement en

souffle," does not make sense in most contexts, as Th's special pleading for it in this passage demonstrates.

Re pronounces that *satrā́ca(ḥ)* is for **satrā́ñcaḥ* [he omits accent] by fiat; Ge (n. 4cd) would like to do the same. But I see no reason why we, the goal of their journey, would not be focused on the arrivals, with the form therefore the acc. pl. it appears to be.

X.77.5: Acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, this vs. is in Jagatī, against the rest of the hymn, which the Anukr. labels Triṣṭubh. For vs. 5 the Anukr. is half right: the first two pādas again have a Jagatī cadence but 11 syllables and do not fit the template of what emerged as the standard such pattern earlier in the hymn. But the 2nd hemistich consists of two entirely well-behaved Jagatī pādas.

This is the last of the simile-laden vss., a structure signaled by ring composition: the last word of 5 is *(pari-)prúṣaḥ* 'showering (all around)', which matches the first word of the hymn, *(abhra-)prúṣaḥ* 'showering (from a cloud)' (see also the subj. *pruṣā́* also in 1a).

In b it is unclear what 'light-possessors' (*jyótiṣmant-*) the Maruts are being compared to. Both Ge and Re fail to provide a referent, while Scar (343) supplies 'dawns', which would be difficult, since *jyótiṣmantaḥ* is masc. I suggest rather 'fires', on the basis of X.35.1 ... *agnáyo, jyótir bháranta uṣáso vyùṣṭiṣu* "... fires bringing light at the early brightenings of the dawn," with the same *vyùṣṭiṣu* as here.

In d *prava-* belongs to the root √*pru* / *plu* 'float'; the *r*-form here allows the phonetic figure *pravā́saḥ ... prásitāsaḥ pariprúṣaḥ*.

X.77.6–8: The last three vss. are conventional in content and have proper Triṣṭubh cadences throughout.

X.77.6: The structure of the vs. is somewhat unclear. Both Ge and Re take bc as qualifying the subj. of the *yád* clause in pāda a, with d as the corresponding main clause. I find this unlikely: pāda d is a repeated pāda (=VI.47.13, X.131.7, save for *yuyota* for *yuyotu*; cf. also VII.58.6), and repeated pādas are less likely to be integrated into a subord. cl. / main cl. diptych. Moreover, d has no logical connection with the rest. I instead think bc is itself the main clause, though it lacks a finite verb. We can either supply a verb of motion, as in the publ. tr., or take the participle *vidānā́saḥ* as the predicate of the main cl.

However we choose to take bc, the structure of these two pādas is itself noteworthy. What governs the gen. phrase *maháḥ saṃváraṇasya vásvaḥ* in b must be the participle *vidānā́saḥ* in c, which contains another gen., *rā́dhyasya*, to be construed with the genitives in b. The postponement of the governing verb across the half-vs. boundary strikes me as somewhat unusual, though far from excluded. Note the play on *vásu-*, which knits the pādas together.

Pace Gr, *vidāná-* must belong to √*vid* 'know', not 'find', since, as Re points out, only 'know' takes genitive complements.

X.77.7: The *ná* in b seems unnecessary, or at least displaced, since it would be odd to compare some entity to the Maruts in their own hymn. (Ge supplies "[to the singers], as to the Maruts," since he thinks that b concerns the distribution of the Dakṣiṇā. But this would be an odd use of *ná*, and further I see no evidence of the Dakṣiṇā. Re vaguely adds "pour ainsi dire.") In a hymn with so many *ná*-s, often in the "wrong" place, a pleonastic *ná* should not surprise us, but in fact I think we can justify it. In my interpr. two factors are at work. On the one hand, it may be playing off 8b:

7b xxxx *ná mān*(*uṣo*) xxx

8b xxxx *nā́m*^{a}*n*(*ā)* xxxx

[On the reading of 'name' in 8b, see comm. ad loc.] On the other hand, I think there is a suppressed comparison in pāda a. The human priest, descendant of Manu (*mā́nuṣaḥ*), in b is implicitly compared to the figure who is often "standing up at the ceremony" (*adhvareṣṭhā́*-), namely Agni. See Scar's phraseological parallels (643–44) VI.63.4 *ūrdhvó vām agnír adhvaréṣu asthāt* and X.20.5 *ūrdhvas tasthāv ṛ́bhvā yajñé*, both of Agni.

X.77.8: As noted ad vs. 7, I read distracted *nā́m*^{a}*nā* (with Gr and, tentatively, Old), which, in my interpr., allows a phonetic play with 7b. Distracting *ādit*^{i}*yéna* as HvN do seems far less plausible: this stem is almost never distracted, and in this case it would produce a highly unusual rhythm for the opening, with light syllables in the 2nd and 3rd positions, and for a late break, with two heavy syllables.

Note the etymological play between *ū́māḥ* (a) and *avantu* (c).

As disc. above, ad 2d, the connection with the Ādityas is puzzling.

The rt-noun cmpd *rathatū́r* in c raises several questions: it is a singular used of plural subjects and it doesn't seem to have any bearing semantically on the Maruts' activity here: aiding our inspired thought. In my view it must be an unmarked simile, with a horse as underlying referent (see I.88.2 *rathatū́rbhir áśvaiḥ*) and generally refer to the Maruts' swiftness and victoriousness, qualities that might help produce a swift and victorious inspired thought for us. On the pl. Maruts compared to a singular entity, see the next hymn, X.78.2 *agnír ná*. Contra JSK I do not think *rathatū́r* is conjoined with pāda d: "overtaking the chariots [*rathatū́ḥ* for **rathatúraḥ*] and finding pleasure in the ceremony in their great course" (DGRV I.95) (sim. Ge). Among other things, the Maruts can hardly enjoy the ceremony if they're on the road.

As for d and the *ca* therein, I take it as conjoining the two locc., (*maháś ca) yā́man* and *adhvaré*, in a modified X *ca* Y construction (with the *ca* following the first word of the first loc. phrase. The standard X Y *ca* construction was avoided here to forestall the double *ca* that would have arisen because of the flg. pf. part. *cakānā́ḥ*: **mahó yā́man adhvaré* <u>*ca*</u> <u>*ca*</u>*kānā́ḥ*.

Finally, what is the referent of *maháḥ*? I suggest that it is the Maruts' "great host"; cf. in the next hymn X.78.6 *mahāgrāmó ná yā́man* "like a great host on their journey."

X.78 Maruts

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

Though the Anukr. identifies vss. 1, 3, 4, 8 as Triṣṭubhs and 2, 5–7 as Jagatīs, in fact 1, 3, and 4, like many of the "Triṣṭubhs" in the previous hymn, mostly consist of 11-syllable pādas with Jagatī cadences, and though the vss. identified as Jagatīs have Jagatī cadences, at least 6c has only 11 syllables. By contrast, the final vs., 8, begins with a pāda containing 12 syllables but a Triṣṭubh cadence, but then provides three conventional Triṣṭubh pādas to bring the hymn to a settled and metrically safe conclusion.

X.78.1: Pāda c has 10 syllables but a Jagatī cadence.

The first three pādas end in an adj. in *su*-, which furnishes the point of comparison. The first two seem to sketch a ritual progression: the poets (*víprāsaḥ*) of pāda a have good intention or purpose, are attentive in their ritual activity. Elsewhere such ritualists are depicted as "seeking

the gods": cf. III.8.4 *svādhyò mánasā devayántaḥ*, VII.2.5 *svādhyàḥ ... devayántaḥ*. This is the next step in our vs., with *devāvyàḥ* 'pursuing the gods' (with root √*vī*, not a *-ya*-denom.) opening pāda b. And the happy result is found at the end of b, *svápnasaḥ* 'having good profit'; as we all know, successful ritualist get well rewarded.

Re sees the vs. as embodying the three functions, which seems a stretch to me.

As Ge points out (n. 1d), the Maruts are described as *máryā arepásaḥ* in V.53.3.

X.78.2: In this supposedly Jagatī vs., d contains only 11 syllables; the other pādas conform. This pāda is also structurally aberrant, in that the shared property, *suśármaṇaḥ* 'providing good shelter', occurs first in the pāda, not last. (Pāda a also deviates in this regard: the shared property is *bhrā́jas-* 'flash' in mid-pāda.)

For the possible senses of *svayúj-* see Scar 433–35. I favor 'own yokemates' rather than 'self-yoking': the winds and the Maruts can be yoked together because they are equally speedy. (This sense of *svayúj-* also works well in the other two occurrences: X.67.8, 89.7.) This swiftness is underlined by the shared property, 'bringing immediate aid' (*sadyáūtayaḥ*): they appear as soon as needed.

In c I would slightly alter the tr. of *prajñātā́raḥ* to "who know the way forward."

I do not know why soma drinks are esp. associated with good shelter. In the IXth Maṇḍala Soma occasionally provides or is asked for shelter (e.g., IX.86.15; see passages in Lub s.v. *śárman-*), but not as often as other gods in other maṇḍalas. The bahuvr. *suśárman-* once modifies Agni and Soma in the dual (I.93.7), but this is surely because of Agni, who is the usual referent of this adj. (e.g., V.8.2).

X.78.2–3: As noted in the publ. intro., "winds" are the comparanda in these two adjacent vss., 2b and 3a.

X.78.3: *dhúnayaḥ* can belong either with the simile (so Ge, publ. tr.) or the frame (so Re). The structure of the hymn, with, usually, a single shared property per simile, favors the former, but the fact that *dhúni-* regularly modifies the Maruts (I.64.5, 87.3, etc.) the latter. A possible alternative tr. would be "The boisterous ones who, like the winds, are always on the move."

Given the metrical patterns established, we should expect pāda c to have a Jagatī cadence despite its 11 syllables. But in fact it has a cadence that fits neither Jagatī nor Triṣṭubh: L H H x (*śímīvantaḥ*). Elsewhere this stem sometimes has to be read **sími**i**vant-* with light 2nd syllable (see comm. ad X.8.2), but that wouldn't help here. Best would be **śimīvataḥ*, but we need the nom. pl. *-vantaḥ*.

In d we see the same ritual cause-and-effect as in 1ab: the "lauds of the ancestors" (*pitṝṇā́m ... śáṃsāḥ*) result in lovely gifts, as the proper reciprocal response to praise.

X.78.4: *sánābhayaḥ* is a pun, in that *nā́bhi-* refers both to the nave of a wheel into which the spokes are fitted and the navel of the human body. The Maruts "have the same navel," because they are the sons of the same mother, Pṛśni (also the same father, Rudra, but it's motherhood that's relevant to the navel).

In c the *máryāḥ* reappear from 1d (also X.77.3). The common property shared by the Maruts and the "young bloods gone awooing" is *ghṛtaprúṣ-* 'sprinkling ghee', which is not directly appropriate for either party – although more for the Maruts than the wooers. The root √*pruṣ* is very prominent in the immediately preceding Marut hymn (X.77), with the rt noun

cmpds *abhra-prúṣ-* (1a) and *pari-prúṣ-* (5d), as well as subjunctive *pruṣā* (1a), so the act of showering/sprinkling is characteristic of them. The ghee that they are showering here must be metaphorical, representing rain (so also, e.g., Scar 343); the same act is attributed to them in I.168.8 *yádī ghṛtám marútaḥ pruṣṇuvánti*, where it clearly refers to rain. Moreover, two other occurrences of *ghṛta-prúṣ-* (VI.44.20, VII.47.1) modify *ūrmí-* 'wave' and presumably refer to water as well. But it is hard to envision *máryāḥ* showering either real or metaphorical ghee. Ge's tr. indicates that in the simile he takes the cmpd to mean "verschwenderisch" (prodigal), and this is possible; Re bleaches it to mean simply "zélé au rite." I would alternatively point to III.13.4 ... *pruṣṇávad vásu* "he will shower goods" and suggest that we supply "goods" as the gapped obj. of *-prúṣ-* in the simile; "goods" would be the potential bridal gifts.

X.78.5: I render *jyéṣṭha-* differently here and in 2c, because neither 'elder' nor 'superior' easily fits both contexts.

Pāda b can be variously interpr., depending on the sense attributed to the desid. part. *didhiṣú-*. As discussed elsewhere (comm. ad I.71.3, X.26.6 and see my forthcoming Bühler lecture), *didhiṣú-* can have the developed sense 'desiring to acquire (a wife)' = 'suitor, wooer'. Ge takes it thus ("wie freiende Ritter," though see his cautious n. 5b), as does the publ. tr. This interpr. has the merit of making sense of *sudā́navaḥ* 'having good gifts', i.e., providing good bridal gifts, and it also thematically matches 4c *vareyávo ná máryāḥ* "like young bloods gone awooing" in the immediately preceding vs. The charioteers on this bridal errand are (somewhat) reminiscent of the bride-seeking journey in Kakṣīvant's dānastuti, I.126.3, 5, esp. 3b *vadhū́manto dáśa ráthāsaḥ* "ten chariots carrying brides." However, it would be possible to interpr. *didhiṣú-* literally as 'desiring to acquire', without a marital context. In this case, *sudā́navaḥ* would be proleptic, expressing the gifts they will acquire. Re's tr. uses the non-technical sense of the participle, but considers its gapped object to be victory, not gifts: "qui (reçoivent) de beaux dons comme des conducteurs-de-char cherchant à obtenir (la victoire)." I prefer the Ge/publ. tr. version but an alternative would be "who (will) possess good gifts like charioteers seeking to acquire (them)."

Note that *jigatnávaḥ* returns from 3a.

The question in c is what to do with *udábhiḥ*, and this question can be divided into two: 1) should it be construed with *nimnaíḥ*, likewise instr. pl.? 2) does it belong in the simile or the frame? The first is easily answered: though Re takes the two together ("avec les eaux déclives"), *nimná-* is always elsewhere a noun ('depth, the deep') and so the two instr. pl.s must be taken separately. The second is more difficult. Ge (as well as Re) takes *udábhiḥ* with the simile ("wie die Flüsse ... mit ihren Gewässern"), and this is certainly possible: though there are two words for 'water' in the phrase (Ge's "Flüsse" is misleading for *ā́paḥ*), *ā́paḥ* are of course animate and agentive, while *udán-* is neuter and an inert substance. Nonetheless, I think *udábhiḥ* must be at least partially part of the frame, referring to the water the Maruts produce as rain (just referred to in *ghṛtaprúṣaḥ* in 4c), hence my "always on the move with their moisture." However, I am now willing to entertain the possibility that *udábhiḥ* is shared by simile and frame and suggest the alternative translation "always on the move with their waters [=rain] like the Waters with their waters (moving) through the depths."

The exact point of d is unclear, though I don't think Ge helps by making *viśvárūpāḥ* a proper noun qualifier of the Aṅgirases. I see *viśvárūpa-* as the shared property, placed unusually in initial position (but see *suśármāṇaḥ* in 2c). I think the idea here must be that the Maruts are inventive and skilled singers like the Aṅgirases and their sāmans are thus ornamented with every

possible variation. The Maruts' "sāmans" are quite possibly the sounds of the thunderstorm: the thunder itself and the howling of the wind, often highlighted in Marut hymns.

X.78.6: Once again Re considers this vs. to express the three functions (First Function in ab, Third (?) in c, Second in d – he is only explicit about ab). This seems to me to be in the realm of fantasy.

Pāda a is difficult to interpr. because it is not clear what is the shared property and what belongs to the simile. Ge (at least in his tr., but see his n. 6a) takes *sūrí-* as the shared property, which he tr. as an adj. "freigebig": the Maruts give abundant rain, the pressing stones abundant soma. In his interpr. *síndhumātaraḥ* exclusively modifies the stones ("wie die sindhugeborenen Presssteine," though again see his n. 6a). Re also takes *sūrí-* as the shared property (though he properly tr. as a noun, with a certain amount of extra machinery), with *síndhumātaraḥ* exclusively modifying the Maruts: "(Eux qui jouent le rôle de) patrons comme les pierres-presseuses, (ces dieux) dont la Sindhu est la mère." Klein's tr. (DGRV I.350) seems to contain no shared property, but identifies the Maruts as *sūrí-* and the pressing stones as Sindhu-mothered: "The lords, like pressing-stones whose mother is the Indus." In contrast to all of these, the publ. tr. takes *síndhumātaraḥ* as the shared property, with the Maruts identified as *sūrí-* (as in V.52.16). As to *síndhumātaraḥ*, I see the stones as having a river as mother because they have been smoothed as they tumble in the river (though I have no textual evidence for this) and the Maruts are said to have a heavenly river as mother, who would produce the water they distribute as rain. See nearby X.75.3, which establishes a heavenly (3a *divî*), rain-producing (3c... *prá stanayanti vṛṣṭáyaḥ*) Sindhu (3d *síndhur yád éti* ...), and note that this would continue the watery theme of our vs. 5c. Although I think this interpr. is more than defensible, I would also consider an alternate more like Ge/Re, though I then don't know who to identify as *síndhumātaraḥ*: "Patrons, like the pressing stones whose mother is a river" or "Having a river as mother, they are patrons like the pressing stones" (slight preference for the first).

In b the shared property occupies most of the pāda: #*ādardirā́saḥ ... viśváhā*#. The word *ádri-* can also be used to refer to the pressing stones (like *grā́van-* in a), and the image is of their constantly pounding the soma plant, as the Maruts-as-storm pound the earth. Note the phonetic figure *ādardirā́so ádrayo*. The use of *ádri-* as subj. of √*dṛ* is rather cute, because on several occasions it is the object, when it refers to the Vala cave: see IV.16.8 ... *yád ... ádriṃ dárdar*, IV.1.14 ... *dadṛvā́ṃso ádrim*.

In c the hapax *śiśū́la-* seems to be an affectionate, colloquial diminutive (note the *l*-form), though AiG II.2 862–63 doesn't explicitly recognize such a function for the *-la*-suffix. Note that pāda-final *sumātáraḥ* exactly echoes *s(índh)umātaraḥ*, which ends pāda a.

There is no agreement on the position and function of *utá* in d. Ge seems to take it as introducing the shared property (which he takes as *tviṣā́*) and therefore connecting d with the rest of the vs., though displaced: "und mit ihren Funkeln wie ein grosser Klan auf dem Kriegszug." Klein (DGRV I.350) also thinks *utá* is conjoining pāda d with the rest of the vs., but without flg. Ge's linkage of the two words in the phrase *utá tviṣā́*; he therefore offers no explanation for the late position of *utá* if it is conjoining pādas. Re and the publ. tr. take *utá* as (unusually) conjoining nouns, in the case-mismatched phrase *yā́mann utá tviṣā́*. I still think this is the best explan., with *utá* used instead of *ca* perhaps because of the case disharmony. But a tr. like Ge's "And with their turbulence (they are) like a great host (of warriors) on their journey" would be possible and would offer a different explanation for the unusual position of *utá*.

The use of *mahāgrāmá-* here certainly fits Rau's interp. of the term *grā́ma-* as, in the first instance, "a roving band"; see comm. ad X.27.19, though as disc. there I think it has already developed the sense 'village' in some occurrences in the RV.

For *tviṣā́* here I'd now substitute "turbulence" or "agitation" for "turmoil."

X.78.7: My rendering of *adhvaraśríyaḥ* as "providing splendor to the ceremony" is next-door to transitive. On the interpretational problems of *-śrī́*-cmpds in general see comm. ad III.26.5 and for this cmpd I.44.3. I'd now consider a more overt transitive rendering "completing/perfecting the ceremony" as alternative here.

As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. introduces the first finite verbs in this hymn: *vy àśvitan* (b) and *mamire* (d).

I also think that the vs. has loosened up in another way: the rigid independence of pādas found through the rest of the hymn is broken in the second hemistich, by my interpr. (and Re's). By this interpr. the simile of c consists only of *síndhavo ná yayyàḥ*, with the last word in this pāda, *bhrā́jadṛṣṭayaḥ*, belonging with d; it does not fit easily with the simile in c. Ge takes it with the rest of c, but not, it seems, as the shared property: "Wie die Ströme eilend mit blinkenden Speeren." In either type of interpr. the problem is *yayyàḥ*, which ought to be fem. and therefore not applicable to the Maruts. Re suggests it's been attracted to *síndhavaḥ* and, more to the point, adduces II.37.5 *yayyàm ... rátham*, where the adj. modifies a masc. I think it likely that it matches / assimilates to masc. *vṛkī́*-inflected stems like *rathī́-* 'charioteer', with nom. pl. *rathyàḥ*.

The last question in this vs. concerns the simile in d, and how we interpr. it depends on the morphological identity of *parāvátaḥ*. Usually this form is an ablative "from the/a distance," but in a minority of cases it is the homonymous acc. pl. This morphological identity is clearest when it is construed with *tisrás* "the three distant realms" (I.34.7, VIII.5.8, 32.22), though it is found elsewhere. I think this is one of those places: acc. pl. *parāvátaḥ* is the comparandum (*ná*) for acc. pl. *yójanāni*, hence my tr. "the stages of their journey (*yójanāni*) like distant realms" – indicating how vast a distance the Maruts can cover in a single stage. If I am correct, this is also the first and only simile in this hymn that is not in the nom. pl. I seem to be alone in this interpr., however: both Ge and Re (in different ways) take *parāvátaḥ* as ablative and the simile is quite recessive.

X.78.8: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. entirely departs from the style and structure of the rest of the hymn, both in content and in meter. It is a conventional hymn-final vs. begging for rewards for the praise conferred. It also contains the only occurrence of the word Marut in the hymn – solving the implicit riddles posed by the torrent of similes. Metrically it is the only standard Triṣṭubh – *except* for the 1st pāda, which has a Triṣṭubh cadence but twelve syllables (the opposite of much of the rest of the hymn with Jagatī cadences and eleven syllables). One of these syllables is entirely unnecessary: the *no* in 4th position, which doubles the *asmā́n* opening b. But, as sketched in the publ. intro., the *no* is the punning link between this vs. and the rest of the hymn. Almost every previous pāda has the simile particle *ná* in 2nd position, usually in syllable 4 (sometimes 5, occasionally elsewhere). The enclitic *no* in 8a deliberately (in my view) echoes this pattern of *ná*-s, and the fact that it disturbs the meter draws attention to it.

The part. *vāvṛdhānā́ḥ* is rendered as reflexive/passive by Ge and Re. This is the usual function of this form, but it can also be (self-beneficial) transitive. I read it as both; see VIII.96.8, where it is transitive in the frame and intransitive in the simile.

On the slightly awkward phrase *ratnadhéyāni sánti*, see VII.53.3 *utó hí vāṃ ratnadhéyāni sánti* and (with √*bhū*) IV.34.4 *ábhūd u vo vidhaté ratnadhéyam.*

X.79–80

Two hymns to Agni, both attributed to Agni Saucīka or Agni Vaiśvānara, with Sapti Vājaṃbhara listed as an alternate poet for X.79. This last name is obviously extracted from X.80.1 *sáptiṃ vājaṃbharám*.

X.79 Agni

On the (pseudo-?)omphalos structure of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.79.1: The first word of the hymn is the augmented impf. *ápaśyam*, which the publ. tr. renders "I have seen." This still seems to me a likely tr. and fits well with the present-tense verbs that follow describing Agni's activities. However, given that, per IH, imperfects should not have immediate past sense, an alternate would be simply "I saw." On the implicit conceptual correction to this statement, see comm. ad vs. 4.

Unaccented *asya* should not be a demonst. adj. with *mahatáḥ* (*pace* Re "de ce grand (dieu)" and probably Ge), and it should refer to something already in the discourse, despite being only the 2nd word in the hymn. The ritual fire beside which the poet is reciting the hymn fits the bill – the "discourse" must include the shared ritual situation.

The sense of *nā́nā* 'each for itself' (see comm. ad II.12.8) is rather attenuated here, to 'alternately' vel sim. It is notable that *nā́nā* appears often with duals: II.12.8, III.54.5, 55.11, V.73.4.

With Re, I take *ásinvant-* (and the adj. *asinvá-*) to mean 'insatiable', contra Ge (and EWA s.v. *asinvá-*) 'without chewing/biting'. 'Insatiable' fits the contexts better, as well as the derivation from **seh₂* 'satiate, satisfy' (EWA ibid.). Esp. in this context, 'not biting' would be directly contradicted by the flg. word *bápsatī* 'chewing'.

X.79.2: This vs. focuses on body parts – of the fire (head [*śíraḥ*], eyes [*akṣī́*], tongue [*jihváyā*]) and of the priests (feet [*paḍbhíḥ*], hands [*-hasta-*]). The image of the fire must be standing on its head, with the (top of the) head on or in the ground, where the flames originate and differentiate, and the flames above this source being his tongues. What exactly his eyes are and where they are are unclear to me – much less why Agni has two (and only two?) eyes, but *akṣī́* must be dual and is so interpr. by the Pp. This puzzle has elicited little or no comment from moderns; Sāy.'s interpr., that Agni's two eyes are the sun and the moon, may be correct. They are light sources comparable to Agni and roughly eye-shaped. This certainly accounts for the dual, which needs to be accounted for, and they are spatially 'separate, apart' (*ṛ́dhak*) from the rest of the scene. If this is correct, the visual image conjured up is a kind of Vedic proto-cubism, with the eyes removed from the upside-down face and stuck into the sky, rather than between the top of the head and the mouth/tongue, where they ordinarily are found. So be it – it wouldn't be the strangest RVic image ever!

And it is already challenged by pāda c. The priests collecting foodstuffs for Agni "with their feet" (*paḍbhíḥ*) makes them sound as if they have prehensile monkey-like toes, but surely it just refers to the priests' walking in the brushland to collect firewood (though I'm quite sure the poet was well aware of the bizarre image he was creating).

Note that the pāda-final verb *sám bharanti* matches *sám bharete* in the same position in 1d.

X.79.3: With the standard tr. going back to antiquity, I interpr. "the hidden place of the mother" (*mātúḥ ... gúhyam*) to be her breast, which the child /young fire is seeking.

Also with the standard tr., I assume an unsignaled change of subject in cd. Agni must be the one "gleaming" in the acc. (*śucántam*) in c, so the subj. of *avidat* is the priest or another mortal. His "finding" of Agni may depict the moment when the fire-kindling priest perceives the first glimmer of flame in the dried vegetation assembled for the kindling.

There is some difference of opinion (see Ge n. 3c) as to whether *sasám ... pakvám* refers to "cooked food" or "ripe grain(field)," with the former mostly favored (Sāy., Ge, Re), though Old and Kü (429) opt for the latter, as do I. I take *śucántam* as the shared property; most take the simile just with *avidat* ("found him like cooked food"). The image in my view is that of the sun gleaming on the golden heads of ripe grain (see the photos in Google Images of ripe barley).

ripáḥ is a problem. With most, I take it as belonging with the phrase *ripó ágram* in III.5.5, which is a variant of the likewise problematic *ágre rupáḥ* in IV.5.7 (see comm. ad loc.). Here *upásthe antáḥ* substitutes for *ágra-* as the location of the mysterious *ri/up-*.

X.79.4: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. structurally functions as an omphalos vs. and is introduced as if with a revelation: *tád ṛtám ... prá bravīmi* "I proclaim this truth" – though the truth is fairly humdrum.

Note also that though the poet began the hymn with *ápaśyam* "I saw," in this vs. he admits that he, as a mortal, does not perceive (*nā́ham ... mártyaś ciketa*); only Agni does. Along with his confession of ignorance in vs. 6, the poet seems to be asserting that visual perception (1a) is not sufficient.

X.79.5: This vs. accomplishes a tricky switch of referents: pāda a contains a dat. sg. m. pronominal *asmai*, c the same, but *tásmai*. The first is a 3rd ps. ref. to Agni, the second a 3rd ps. ref. to the sacrificer, who is represented in ab by *yáḥ* as subject of the three verbs in that hemistich. Meanwhile, Agni resurfaces as subj. of cd but in the 2nd ps. (*ví cakṣe ...*, *ágne ... asi tvám*).

There is a possible alternative interpr. of ab, which does not actually change much. In both the publ. tr. and the standard tr., *púṣyati* at the end of b has the sacrificer as subj. and a (semi-)transitive sense, 'prosper s.o.'. It owes its accent to being in the relative clause. However, it's possible to read it as the verb of the main clause to which *yáḥ ... juhóti* is subordinated. It would then owe its accent to being 1st in its clause, and would express the happy result for the hard-working sacrificer: "Whoever sets out dry food for him, pours oblations with melted butter and ghee for him, he [=sacrificer] prospers." The verb would have the less common intrans. sense. The second hemistich would begin a new sentence. I do not favor this alternative, however.

The puzzling "two eyes" of Agni in 2a are here replaced (/repaired) by a thousand eyes (*sahásram akṣábhiḥ*) more appropriate to a multiply glittering god.

X.79.6: This vs. turns on the pun between the perfects *cakartha* (√*kṛ*) in pāda a and *cakarta* (√*kṛt* 'cut') in d. The first thing to say is that the publ. tr. contains an outright error: *cakarta* is of

course a 3rd sg. ('he cut') not a 2nd sg. ('you cut'), however tempting the latter is. The pāda should read "he cut apart (the wood) piece by piece, as a knife does a cow joint by joint."

The vs. also presents itself in the fashion of an omphalos hymn, with the speaker, confessing ignorance, asking the god for enlightenment (b: *ágne pṛchā́mi nú tvā́m ávidvān* "Agne, unknowing I ask you now") about a grave offense to the gods (pāda a). This is highly reminiscent of the anguished questioning of Varuṇa by the poet in the famous dialogue hymn VII.86 (esp. vs. 3). But here it's actually a joke! The poet isn't asking about his own faults, but Agni's – and the only evidence that Agni has committed a transgression is that he "eats without teeth," a natural fact that never slows down Agni's consumption, as d demonstrates.

As Re points out, *áttave 'dán* is a pun on √*ad* 'eat' (*át-tave*) and *dánt-* 'tooth' (*a-dánt-*).which, if we back-project it far enough, becomes an etymological figure.

X.79.7: The tr. 'that face in all directions' is misleading for *víṣūcaḥ*, since it sounds as if *víśva-* were involved. Better 'facing in diverse/multiple directions'; see comm. ad VI.59.5. These horses are of course his flames.

Although Gr glosses *ṕjīti-* as 'glühend, strahlend', most modern comm. and tr. take it rather to mean 'of straight course' vel sim; see the tr. of the various passages by Ge, Re, as well as EWA s.v. – though see Kü's tr. of the phrase in this passage (149) "mit glühenden (?) Zügeln." Although *ṕji-* 'shining' could easily be a Caland form to *ṛjrá-* in the part of the latter's range that means 'silvery, shining', a relationship to *ṛjú-* 'straight' is also probable. The formation of *ṕjīti-* is not clear: though AiG II.2.628 seems to favor a suffixal form, comparable to *dabhī́ti-* 'harmful', it also mentions the possibility of a cmpd with *iti-* to √*i* 'go', which I would favor. See EWA, which mentions both. The stem occurs 4x in the RV; the passage that most clearly supports 'having a straight course, going straight' is VI.75.12, where it qualifies an arrow. In our passage, 'straight' is better than 'shining', though since Agni is involved, 'shining' is obviously not excluded. X.21.2 of an oblation and X.75.7 of a river are friendlier to 'shining', but 'straight' works well in both.

With Ge and Re, I take *mitrá-* as a qualifier of Agni (my 'ally'; their 'friend'), in contrast to Kü (107, 149), who takes it as a ref. to Mitra. Agni as distributor of the oblation to the gods makes better sense than Mitra as subj. of *cakṣadé*. The adj. *sújāta-* is also more appropriate for Agni, esp. since his birth featured earlier in the hymn: most of the singular forms of (differently accented) *sujātá-* qualify Agni, as well as the majority of the same to *sújāta-*.

X.80 Agni

On the insistent repetitive structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. Because of the relentless fronting of Agni in the original, I have tried to keep Agni close to the front in the tr., even when it is awkward.

X.80.1: The cmpd. *karmaniṣṭhā́-* is variously rendered (see the standard tr. as well as Scar 648–49); on my understanding of *niṣṭhā́-*, which matches Scar's, see comm. ad III.31.10 and for further cmpds using *niṣṭhā́-* VIII.2.9; as for root noun cmpds of the type NOUN – PREV.+ROOT (and their avoidance) see comm. ad I.124.7 and my "Limits on Root-Noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian" (Fs. Kellens, 2024).

As I have argued elsewhere (see now comm. ad X.28.2, inter alia), *kukṣí-* originally, and in most of its Vedic occurrences, meant 'cheek'; however, here it shows the transferred sense 'belly' in the cmpd *vīrá-kukṣi-* 'having a hero in her belly' (< 'having a belly with a hero [in it]').

It is surely no accident that this is a pregnant belly, which physically resembles a puffed-out cheek.

X.80.2: The form of Agni that opens pāda a, gen. *agnéḥ*, is the only interruption of the string of nom. sg. *agníḥ*-s that open every pāda (14 in all) until *agnéḥ* reappears in 4d. Despite the grammatical difference, note that it involves only the change of one vowel.

The problem in pāda a is the gen.(/abl.) *ápnasaḥ*, about which there are many and diverse opinions (see esp. Old). As a neut. noun it cannot modify the other gen., *agnéḥ*. Old and Ge, in different ways, take *ápnasaḥ* as directly dependent on *samídh-* "the kindling of *ápnas-*" – e.g., Old "Das Holzscheit der Gabe des Agni sei herrlich." Re takes it rather as semantically parallel to *bhadrā́* despite the case difference: "... soit réjouissante, (soit signe) de bénéfice." I'm inclined in the Re direction because (as Ge [n. 2a] and Old point out) *bhadrá-* and *ápnas-* are parallel in I.133.9, 20. Here the adj. *bhadrá-* modifies *samídh-* directly, but the noun *ápnas-* must be in an oblique case: "of/for profit."

Agni "enters" the two world-halves by being kindled and spreading his light between them.

Pādas c and d are obviously contrasted, through the polarized terms *ékam ... purū́ṇi*. The sense in the publ. tr. would be clearer if I had fld. Ge and Re in tr. *ékam* as "alone." In other words, Agni gives aid to the warrior fighting alone and against odds, as well as having the power to take on many opponents.

X.80.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is reminiscent of the brisk catalogues of the Aśvins' deeds (so also Re), particularly those found in Kakṣīvant hymns (I.116–20). The similarity extends to the fact that most of the deeds (in pādas a, b, and d) are unknown or barely so. Only the Atri episode (c) is familiar, on which see my Hyenas 228–29; it is worth noting that it's usually the Aśvins who rescue Atri, which supports the notion that this vs. is based on Aśvin models. The destruction of Jarūtha is mentioned twice elsewhere (VII.1.7, 9.6), but with no further details: in VII.1.7 Agni burns him up, but in VII.9.6 it is Vasiṣṭha who smites him (though with Agni apparently present). Nṛmedha figures briefly in X.132.7, but as a rescuer, not a beneficiary. Nṛmedha Āṅgirasa is also a poet to whom the Anukr. attributes VIII.89–90 and 98–99 (all Indra hymns), as well as IX.27 and 29; see also Śakapūta Nārmedha, the supposed poet of X.132. None of these hymns gives any clue to the role of Nṛmedha here.

As noted in the opening comm. to X.76, the Anukr. attributes that hymn to a snake Jaratkarṇa. The relationship is clear, the reason for it is not.

In b *adbhyáḥ* could be either dat. or abl.; the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take it as abl., presumably because "for the waters" makes little sense, and in any case Agni would probably need to get his victim out of the water before burning him. But in the absence of more information about the story, we can't be certain.

X.80.4: On the NP *dráviṇaṃ vīrápeśā(ḥ)* and the gender (dis)agreement therein, see comm. ad IV.11.3. Although in our passage, *vīrápeśā(ḥ)* could be nom. sg. m. and modify Agni, in IV.11.3 Agni is in the ablative: *tvád eti dráviṇam vīrápeśā(ḥ)* and so neut. *dráviṇam* must be the target noun.

X.80.5: Ge (n. 5c) thinks the birds call on Agni "aus Angst"; I'm not sure that this limitation is necessary, esp. since it's not clear to me what Agni could do for flying birds-in-distress.

X.80.6: As Ge points out (n. 6a), pāda a is almost identical to nearby X.83.2, except that Manyu (battle fury) is the addressee there. Although I usually render the vṛddhi deriv. *mā́nuṣa-* as 'stemming from Manu' or the like (so persuaded by JPB), here the more standard 'human' might be better, given *mánuṣaḥ ... jātā́ḥ* in the next pāda, which would otherwise seem to double *mā́nuṣa-*.

On *ví* in b see Old.

Acdg. to Ge (n. 6b; see also Macdonell/Keith, Vedic Index s.v.), Manu and Nahus are two clan ancestors of the Ārya, which seems approximately correct, though Manu is obviously more prominent.

The interpr. of c is hampered by the absence of a verb and by the unclarity of the phrase "the Gandharvan path of truth" (*gā́ndharvīm pathyā́m ṛtásya*). Ge supplies 'knows' and thinks the phrase refers to the right way to sing; Lü (540 n. 2) agrees. Re is rather vague about the purport of the pāda but supplies 'finds' on the basis of III.31.5 *víśvām avindan pathyā́m ṛtásya*. Although this parallel lacks the Gandharva connection (Gandharvas in the RV tend to spread obscurity), it otherwise seems close enough to favor supplying 'find' here too. The path Agni finds is presumably connected with the ritual process, perhaps, with Ge, the sung or at least verbal portion of the ritual.

The word *gávyūti-* is regularly associated with ghee, though the ghee is metaphorical for rain, in the phrase "sprinkle the pastureland with ghee" (*ghṛténa/ghṛtaír gávyūtim √ukṣ*): III.62.16=VIII.5.6, VII.62.5, 65.4. Here I think this metaphorical phrase is given a literal spin: Agni's pastureland – the place he forages for food – is in the actual ghee of the poured oblation. (I owe this explanation to JPB.)

X.80.7: As pointed out in the publ. intro., this vs. breaks the rigid structural pattern of the rest of the hymn – first by beginning the vs. with a trisyllabic form of Agni, dat. *agnáye*, and then by addressing him directly in the 2nd hemistich, with two vocc. *ágne*, thus introducing the 2nd ps. for the first time in the hymn.

[X.81–82 Viśvakarman JPB]

Two hymns (X.81-82) to Viśvakarman are attributed to the dedicand himself.

X.81 Viśvakarman [SJ on JPB]

X.81.1: The publ. tr. is alone among the standard tr. (Ge, Re [both EVP and Hymnes spéc], Don) in rendering *bhúvanāni* as 'beings', rather than their 'worlds'. I would relexify this term here -- though not adopting the "worlds" of the other standard tr., but rather the more neutral "created things." On the one hand, the next vss. of the hymn (2–4, or probably –5ab) concern Viśvakarman's creation of heaven and earth, with no mention of living beings; moreover, the use of *bhúvanāni* in 4d connects better with 5ab (see comm. ad loc.; also X.82.3) if it does not refer to living beings. On the other, in the next, related, hymn X.82, *bhúvanā* in vs. 3 clearly refers to animate beings. So a tr. that encompasses both animate and inanimate senses is called for.

I would slightly change the tr. of pāda a to "pouring all created things as oblation," to make clear that the created things are the contents of the pour, the object of *júhvat*.

Although *āśís-* does often seem to mean 'hope' esp. when modified by *satyá-* in the syntagm "(come) true" (I.179.6, VII.17.2, VIII.44.23, 54.7, X.67.11), it also has a more general ritual sense: prayer, request, "Wunsch bei Opfer" (EWA s.v., Scar. 533), Segenswunsch, which is presumably the earlier meaning: prayers that (may) come to fulfillment. An *āśís-* can be heard (VIII.93.8) and is elsewhere also associated with ritual activity. The most telling passage is X.128.3, which also contains *dráviṇam* as here, whose acquisition is the result of sacrifice, not hope: *máyi devā̆ dráviṇam ā̆ yajantām, máyy āśír astu máyi deváhūtiḥ* "To me let the gods bring material wealth through sacrifice. In me be the prayer; in me the invocation to the gods." I would therefore change the tr. of c to "Seeking material wealth through prayer."

All the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr., as well as Don and Re, Hymnes spéc.) take *prathama-chád-* as "concealing the first ones," and this is probably correct. However, both Old and Scar (130) remind us that *-chád-* could also belong to the root √*chand* 'seem, appear, please' and the cmpd. could mean "appearing as first" (so EWA s.v. *CHAND*). This is a possible alternative.

X.81.2: Since *adhiṣṭhā̆nam* and *ārámbhanam* are identically formed (neuters with *-ana*-suffix) and appear in parallel questions, I think they should be rendered on the same model, though the difference between *kím* (a) and *katamát* (b) should be registered. But the publ. tr. "Which one was providing support?" makes *ārámbhanam* sound like it has personal/animate reference. The precise meaning of *ārámbhanam* depends on whether we consider the underlying lexeme *ā̆* √*rabh* to have the meaning 'begin, undertake' or 'seize hold'; for the former see Ge's "welches war wohl der Anfang." I prefer the latter, both because it lends itself to a locational interpr., like *adhiṣṭhā̆nam*, but also because that's the standard use of the verbal lexeme in the RV.

I would also dispute the interpr. of *adhiṣṭhā̆nam* as "resting place"; the lexeme *ádhi* √*sthā* is fairly common in the RV and it almost always takes *rátham* 'chariot' (or occasionally a word for 'horse') as complement and thus must mean 'mount'; the few exceptions only support this interpr., since they refer to something high (e.g., *dyā̆m* 'heaven' IX.85.9). I would therefore retransl. as "What was the mounting block, which was the grasping place?" This reinterpr. of the two *-ana*-nominals gives a more dynamic picture of the process of creation: V. had to climb onto something and hold on in order to accomplish his act.

On the basis of 4ab, where a *yátaḥ* cl. (b) responds to several questions about the identity of things (a) – "what was the X from which ...," I think that this vs. has the same structure, with the first two questions in ab taken up by *yátaḥ* opening c, with *kathā̆sīt* a parenthetical intrusion. And so I would alter the whole thing to "What was the mounting block, which was the grasping place? — how was it? — / from which V. ..." Here the questions would concern where V. was located for his cosmogonic acts – a reasonable question, since neither heaven nor earth yet existed, and he needed a place from which to operate when there were as yet no places. (A twist on the Archimedes dilemma?)

In d it is unclear whose *mahinā̆* is being referred to. It may well (/is likely to) be Viśvakarman's (with the publ. tr.), but it could rather be that of heaven ("in its greatness"), the interpr. of all the other standard tr. – certainly a possible alt.

Because of the echoes of the god's name in the numerous occurrences of *víśva-*, pointed out in the publ. intro., I think those forms should be consistently tr. with some form of 'all'. In d I would substitute "having his eyes on all" for "who has his eyes on everything."

X.81.3: The heavy repetition of cmpds in *viśvátas-* in the first hemistich reinforces the need to connect these translationally with the god's name. Further, although reducing the four *viśvátas-* cmpds to two in the publ. tr. ("whose eyes and face are turned in every direction, whose arms and feet move in every direction") cuts down on verbiage and indirectly reflects the fact that the two pairs are joined by two *utá*-s, this may be a false economy: surely each cmpd should be given its own weight, even if the result is overweight. (Note also that the first *viśvátaś-cakṣuḥ* echoes the last word of vs. 2, *viśvá-cakṣāḥ*.) I would substitute "Having his eyes turned in all direction, his face turned in all directions, his arms turned in all directions, his feet turned in all directions."

Although "fan(bellows)" – or at least some device that produces a strong airflow to fan the flames of the forge -- is probably close to the real-life referent of *pátatra-* here, the word literally means 'wing', and I would prefer to register that in the tr., with parenthetical identification of the likely referent. So I would substitute "with wings [=fan(bellows?)]." For the smith's use of "feathers of birds" (*parnébhiḥ śakunā́nām*) see IX.112.2 adduced by Ge (n. 3c). The smith as a creative force is also found in X.72.2.

X.81.4: On the structure of the first hemistich, see comm. ad vs. 2 above.

This hemistich very sneakily introduces a puzzle. We have been told throughout the hymn that Viśvakarman is creator of everything, esp. of heaven and earth – most emphatically with the final phrase in the immediately preceding vs. (3d) *devá ékaḥ* "the god alone"; the solitary nature of V. is also stressed in the flg. vs., 5d. But suddenly in this vs. the creators are plural (via the verb *niṣṭatakṣúḥ* "they fashioned"), though unidentified. Who are these extra personnel? Re (EVP XVI, but not Hymnes spéc.) supplies "gods"; Ge (n. 4b): "die Weltschöpfer" (flg. Sāy.), V's helpers. Sim. Don (n. 4) "the assistants of the Creator, perhaps the seven sages" (who appear in the next hymn, also dedicated to Viśvakarman). This hemistich is identical to X.31.7ab in an obscure All God hymn, but we can't simply ascribe the surprising appearance of the plural here to repetitional carelessness: X.81 is obviously carefully crafted, and repeating a hemistich from elsewhere (if that's the direction of repetition) must have been deliberate, esp. because of the apparent contradiction of *devá ékaḥ* in the preceding vs. I don't have an answer, but think the question should be raised (not ignored). I suggest that it's worth considering whether the two actions *are* actually the same (as seems to be generally assumed) – V's producing/begetting (*janáyan* 2c, 3d) H+E versus the "fashioning" performed by an unidentified plural subj. (*nís* √*takṣ* 4d). It is possible that the latter is a kind of secondary creation: they "fashioned / carved out" into defined shapes the undifferentiated mass created by V.; they were then not necessarily present, much less participants, at the first creation. In any case, these plural creators do not reappear in this hymn.

The accent on *pṛcháta* was induced by flg. *íd*. This is a well-known property of this particle, though examples are rarer than Gr leads us to believe. See comm. ad VI.34.3.

I would substitute "that on which he mounted" for "... rested" in d. See comm. on *adhiṣṭhā́nam* in vs. 2.

For "living beings" I would again substitute "created things"; see comm. ad vs. 1.

X.81.5: On the late placement of *utá*, see JSK (DGRV I.350, 352).

The lengthy nominal rel. cl. occupying the whole first hemistich has no overt referent in the main cl. of c. Translators struggle to find a role for these *dhā́māni* in a main cl. that would be complete without them, since *śíkṣa-* normally takes a dative of benefit but not an acc. obj. The

publ. tr. supplies a dat. referring to the *dhā́māni* in addition to the dat. *sákhibhyaḥ*, but this double dative ("do your best for them [=*dhā́māni*] for the sake of your companions ...") doesn't make sense to me; the other tr. try to make the *dhā́māni* into objects of *śíkṣā* in various ad hoc ways. This awkwardness can be solved by attaching 5ab to the preceding pāda (4d), leaving 5cd, with its ritual focus, independent. In this scenario the *dhā́māni* are identified with the *bhúvānāni* ("giving support to the created things [see comm. ad vs. 1] / that are your highest domains ...") or possibly more loosely conjoined with them ("giving support to the created things / (and) those that are your highest domains ..."). The two neut. pl.s are found together in the next hymn, also to Viśvakarman: X.82.3 *dhā́māni véda bhúvanāni víśvā*. It is not clear there whether the two terms are identified or juxtaposed, but their association, as objects of the same verb, is clear – and supports joining our 5ab with 4d.

Then the 2nd hemistich pivots from V's primordial acts of creation to the ritual here-and-now: "do your best for your comrades at the oblation" (c). The last pāda (d) depicts V. as the sole participant in the sacrifice (just as in 3d he was the sole creator), rather like Prajāpati in Middle Vedic: as both the sacrificer and the recipient of sacrifice – the closed loop of the primordial sacrifice before the reciprocal ritual partnership between gods and men was established. I would alter the tr. to reflect this scenario: "increasing your own body, sacrifice to yourself by yourself," taking *tanvàm* in two different senses.

X.81.6: The first hemistich both follows the pattern of 5d and enlarges the sacrificial domain. In 5d, as just noted, V., strengthening himself, himself sacrifices to himself. Our pāda b opens exactly as 5d does, with *svayáṃ yajasva*, but the acc. *tanvàm* of 5d has been replaced by *pṛthivī́m utá dyā́m*. Because of the standard use of the acc. with √*yaj* for the recipient of sacrifice and because of the apparently deliberate repetition-with-variation of the pattern in 5d, I think H+E have to be the sacrificial recipients (so Re EVP) – not the oblation itself (so Don, tentatively Ge [see n. 6b]), despite 1a. Nor can I follow JPB in "by yourself win earth and heaven by sacrifice," since 'win by sacrifice' should have the preverb *ā́*. I also think that the middle participles *vṛdhānáḥ* (5d) and *vāvṛdhānáḥ* (6a) should have the same valence, despite belonging to different tenses stems – I opt for reflexive in both cases, contra the publ. tr., which takes the form in 6d as passive. Putting this all together, I would change the tr. of the hemistich to "Having increased yourself with the oblation, by yourself sacrifice to earth and heaven." Alternatively, *havíṣā* could be construed with somewhat distant *yajasva* ("sacrifice to E+H with an oblation"; *havíṣā* occurs frequently with √*yaj* [see, e.g., X.95.18]), although a passage like VI.69.6 ... *havíṣā vāvṛdhānā́* supports the other interpr. In any case, the point is that the sacrifice is no longer a closed loop, with V. both sacrificer and recipient. With that adjustment, we turn briskly to the present and the concerns of the current sacrificers, further developed in the next vs.

X.81.7: The publ. tr. renders *hávanāni* as "oblations" in c and suggests in the publ. intro. that it is in a ring-compositional relationship with *júhvat* in the first vs. (1a). Unfortunately, *pace* Gr, *hávana-* only means 'call, invocation'; see Re's n. on this vs. in EVP and the otherwise universal tr. as "calls" in the other translations of this vs. This interpr. is supported by *huvema* "we would summon" at the end of the preceding pāda (7b). I would therefore change the tr. to "he will take pleasure in all our invocations." This does not mean that we must abandon the hypothesis of ring composition, but simply recognize here, as often elsewhere, that it's ring composition with a twist. The pādas 1a ... *víśvā bhúvanāni júhvad* # and 7c ... *víśvā hávanāni joṣad* # are structurally and phonologically parallel, with *há-* substituting for *bhú-* and the verbal forms beginning and

ending in the same way (*j ... ad*), with internal -*úhv*- and -*oṣ*- showing some phonological connection. Moreover, *hávanāni* looks like it could belong to the same root as *júhvat* (hence the confusion in the publ. tr.). The poet allows a type of formal ring composition while undercutting the semantics.

As indicated in the comm. ad vss. 2 and 3, I think all forms of *víśva*- in this hymn should be rendered by 'all' – hence my change from "every oblation" (publ. tr.) to "all our invocations"; this should also be applied to *viśvaśaṃbhū́ḥ*; better "luck for all" than "luck for everyone" – or better, because of the bahuvrīhi accent, "providing luck for all."

The final pāda is cleverly constructed, opening and closing with the compounds ***viśva-śaṃbhū́ḥ*** and the hapax *sādhú-**karmā***, whose first and last members combine into the name of the divine dedicand and subject of the hymn.

X.82 Viśvakarman [SJ on JPB]

X.82.1: The "father of the eye" is an odd way to begin a hymn, but like many things in this hymn it is probably multiply ambiguous. Ge and Re think it's the "spiritual" eye of the/a seer, and this is supported by the explanatory *mánasā hí dhī́raḥ* "for he is insightful in mind." But Don suggests that the eye is the sun, which in a creation hymn is certainly possible. We should also keep in mind the descriptor *viśvátaś-cakṣuḥ* 'having his eye turned in all directions' used of Viśvakarman in the previous hymn (X.81.3).

Most tr. render pāda b as "gave birth to the two ... as ghee," identifying the two only as heaven and earth. I find JPB's suggestion that they could also be the offering ladles quite plausible, and ghee qua ghee would fit that sacrificial context.

In c *pū́rve* can mean either 'ancient' or 'eastern' (as indicated by the publ. tr.), and opinions are divided: 'eastern' Ge, Re HSpec, Don; 'ancient' (vel sim.) Re EVP (premières), publ. tr. Here the joint focus on cosmic creation and sacrifice can account for the ambiguity; insofar as this passage concerns the original creation, 'ancient' is appropriate, but as Re (n. 2 in HSpéc) points out, the ritual ground is defined by fixing its boundary to the east, and so cosmic creation can be viewed in light of this sacrificial geography.

The creation envisioned in this vs. seems to consist of two steps (similar to, but not quite the same as, the two steps I saw in the previous hymn, X.81.3–4). It seems that though Viśvakarman "gives birth" to H+E in pāda b, they have not yet settled down and taken their appropriate places. They are still "bobbing up and down" (*nánnamāne*); one can imagine them oscillating in empty space. It is only when their limits were made firm that they could spread out to occupy their assigned location. I do not think this is entirely conveyed by the publ. tr. First, I don't think the action expressed by the intensive part. is an inherent quality of the pair, as "the two that bend up and down" implies; rather, that was their (temporary) state immediately after birth. Further, the action that stops this bobbing, *ádadṛhanta*, should have its full sense of 'become firm', not just 'fixed'. I would retr. bc as "he gave birth to the ghee (and) these two [=H+E], which were bobbing up and down. Only when the ancient/eastern limits were made firm ..." It is interesting that the actions of cd have no agent expressed. Viśvakarman seems to have done his job in b, but how the limits were made firm in c is unspecified, and H+E do their spreading on their own in d. Recall that in X.81.4ab secondary creation (if that's what it is) is not the work of Viśvakarman but of unidentified others.

X.82.2: Note the word play in ***ví**manāḥ ... **ví**hāyāḥ, dhātā̆ **vi**dhātā̆*, with the *vi*'s echoing **Vi**śvakarman, and the last term participating in both that word play and in one with the immed. preceding word. Although I like the idea of registering this repetition, "wide distributor" isn't very informative; I'd prefer to lose the word play for "ordainer and apportioner."

X.82.3: As in the previous vs., I would change "wide distributor" to "apportioner."

The association of *dhā̆māni* and *bhúvanāni* was disc. above ad X.81.5. As noted there, it is unclear whether our phrase *dhā̆māni ... bhúvanāni víśvā* identifies the two nominals ("the domains, (i.e.,) all created things") or asynedetically conjoins them ("the domains (and) all created things"). I'm not sure it makes a great deal of difference.

Again, I'd substitute "created things" for "living beings."

"Make peace" seems an unlikely sense for *sampraśnám* in this context, since there is no suggestion of prior hostilities. I would substitute "take counsel"; see comm. ad IV.18.2, X.69.9.

X.82.4: The secondary creation (if that's what it is) hinted at in the previous hymn (see comm. ad X.81.4), is much better defined here, with both agents (the ancient seers) and results (creating the beings [*bhūtā̆ni*]).

It seems slightly odd to say in pāda a that they acquired wealth by sacrifice *for* him (*asmai*) =Viśvakarman), since the flow of wealth usually goes from gods to (mortal) sacrificers (see, e.g., X.128.3 cited above ad X.81.1). But recall that in X.81.1 Viśvakarman was himself "seeking material wealth through prayer."

The other standard tr. take *bhūnā̆* as part of the simile (e.g., Ge "wie die Sänger in grosser Zahl"), but the publ. tr.'s interpr. with *bhūnā̆* to be read with *dráviṇam* makes more sense to me. To make the purport of the simile clearer, I would add "(now)": "Like singers (now), the ancient seers ..."

The settling of the *rájas-* in c may make reference to the pair (of worlds) that were bobbing up and down after their creation in 1b (q.v.).

X.82.5: The publ. tr. fails to reflect the syntactic structure of the vs. The first hemistich should not be an independent question ("was it ...?") because it's a relative clause, as signaled by the *yád* close to the end of pāda b (but still technically only following a single constituent). Moreover, all the standard tr. render *ásti* as a mere copula, but it is more likely to be an existential here: "what exists beyond heaven ..."

Unfortunately, neut. *yád* seems to be taken up by the masc. *kám ... gárbham* "what was the embryo ...?" I'm afraid that we have to accept this mismatch in gender. See Ge's n. 5c: "*kám* entspricht dem *yát* in b und ist Attraktion zu *gárbham*"; sim. Re EVP. The radical uncertainty of the referent is expressed by the neut. in the rel. cl., but it begins to acquire an identity in the question in the 2nd hemistich and becomes gendered.

The publ. tr. takes the 3rd pl. mid. *samápaśyanta* as intrans. "appeared together," but I think it far more likely that it has the usual transitive sense of the active forms, but is an *-anta* replacement of the usual type, with the middle voice further supported by the preverb *sám*, which frequently triggers middle voice. Although Gr ascribes intrans. value to this form (as well as *sampáśyamānāḥ* in III.31.10, which is also trans. by most people's lights), and Ge follows here (though not in III.31.10), Re (both versions) and Don take it as trans. I would emend to "where/when all the gods together looked upon (it)."

X.82.6: One possible reason to take *samápaśyanta* as intrans. is that in the flg. vs. (6ab), which slavishly follows the phraseology of 5cd, the only change is the verb, to *samágachanta*. But this logic seems to me backwards: since the change of verb is the only alteration, the change should be meaningful; they should not be mere synonyms – at least in the rhetoric of the RV. In simple litanies, like nursery rhymes, a series of semantically identical substitutions might produce the desired singsong effect, but the RV is a different rhetorical beast.

In d I would again substitute "created things" for "living beings."

X.82.7: For "feeding on life" I would substitute "stealing life," as in X.14.12 and X.87.14. On this cmpd see Scar 191–92, inter alia. Ge (n. 7d) thinks this refers to animal sacrifice (Tiermörder bei dem Opfer), but this seems somewhat anachronistic, since the animal sacrifice was and remained an important part of the śrauta system in Vedic times.

X.83–84 Battle Fury

The next two hymns to "Battle Fury" (Manyu) are attributed to a poet Manyu Tāpasa, whose name is transparently derived from the dedicand of the hymn; for the patronymic see *tápasā* in X.83.2, 3. Although not as rigidly structured as X.80 with its relentlessly fronted *agní-*, both of these hymns are quite insistent on the name: *manyú-* appears at least once in every vs. in both hymns and once considerably more (4x in X.83.2) -- except for the last vs. in X.83 (in a different meter). The diction and contents are fairly straightforward, but there is considerable sharing of vocabulary both within and across the hymns. Both hymns are found, in opposite order, in AVŚ IV.32–33; also in AVP IV.32 [=RV X.83] and IV.12 [=RV X.84] but not adjacent.

X.83 Battle Fury

X.83.1: On the voc. phrase *manyo ... vajra sāyaka* see comm. ad X.96.3.

An etymological figure involving √*sah* 'be victorious', beginning in b, continued in c, and exploding in d. For other forms of √*sah* see below.

X.83.2: I don't understand the pf. *āsa*; these identifications would be more powerful if they were not set in the past.

As indicated above, c is almost identical to nearby X.80.6a, though with Agni as the addressee.

X.83.4: Note ... *abhíbhūt^{i}y-ojāḥ*# and *abhimāti-ṣāháḥ*# ending the two pādas of the first hemistich.

Another flurry of √*sah* forms, beginning at the end of b and continuing in c.

X.83.5: It is difficult to ascribe to the nom. part. *sán* its usual concessive force.

For ease of tr. I render the gen. *taviṣásya* as a voc. beside *pracetaḥ*.

Note the phonetic figure ***táva krátvā tavi**ṣasya*.

Note also the contrastive *krátvā* (b) and *akratúḥ* (c).

On nonce act. transitive *jihīḍa* as generated to medial *jihīḍe* 'is angry' (as also suggested by the vocalism), see Kü 610–11.

X.83.5–6: Note the repetition of *méhi* (5d, 6a), reminiscent of the more ubiquitous and regimented concatenations in X.84.

X.83.6: Another √*sah* form, *sáhuri-*, a Lieblingswort of these two hymns: X.83.4, 6; 84.2, 5.

'Suckling all' (*viśvádhāyas-*) seems an incongruous epithet for Battle Fury; it usually characterizes more benign subjects, esp. Agni, but also wealth, the earth, etc. I don't know what it is meant to convey here—perhaps that the Manyu that sweeps us to victory provides us with the spoils we need to thrive.

With JSK (DGRV I.371–72), I take *utá* as conjoining the two imperatival clauses ... *ā́ vavartsva* (c) and *utá bodhi āpéḥ* (d), with the first dual subjunctive clause *hánāva dásyūn* parenthetically inserted.

The impv. clause *bodhi āpéḥ* raises the question: which root does *bodhi* belong to -- √*bhū* or √*budh*? Re opts for the former, on the basis of VIII.3.1 *āpír no bodhi* "become our friend" and of the impv. *bhavā* in the next vs. (7a). However, this leaves him floundering in attempting to explain the clear gen.(/abl.) *ā́peḥ*. Much better to follow Old, Ge, and Klein (inter alia) and take it to √*budh* 'be aware', which takes a gen. complement by rule.

X.83.7: This vs., particularly the 1st hemistich, is apparently modeled on VIII.100.2, in a brief dialogue between Vāyu (VIII.100.1) and Indra (vs. 2): the even pādas (100.2d, 83.7b) are identical and the preceding odd pādas very similar: VIII.100.2c *ásaś ca tváṃ dakṣiṇatáḥ sákhā me* "and you will be my comrade on my right side' v. our *dakṣiṇató bhavā me* "be on my right side" (with *ā́pi-* 'friend' in 6d). Indra's offer to Vāyu of the first drink of soma in VIII.100.2ab is similar to our cd, where the poet offers Manyu the best of the soma and suggests they two will drink it together silently. The ritual tech. term *upāṃśú* is found only here in the RV; on its sense see Re (Vocab. rit. véd.), Sen (Dict. of Vedic Rituals) both s.v. It refers to a kind of near-silent recitation; the first drawing of soma at the Morning Pressing is done this way. And of course Vāyu gets the first drink of soma.

X.84 Battle Fury

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is characterized by verbal concatenation, with the final word of one vs. picked up at the beginning of the next: *agní-* 'fire' in 1d/2a, *éka-* 'alone' 3d/4a, *ví* √*ji* 'be victorious' + √*kṛ* 'make' 4d/5a, *ā́* √*bhū* '(come) into existence, be at hand' 5d/6a, (*dhana-*) *sám* √*sṛj* 'pour in spoils' 6d/7a; only 2d/3a lacks this type of concatenation (but see below). In fact, the concatenation carries over the hymn boundary: in vs. 1d *abhí prá yantu* "let them go forth on attack" echoes X.83.7a *abhí préhi* "go forth on attack" in the last vs. of the preceding hymn.

X.84.1: On the verbal concatenation with the last vs. of the previous hymn, see immed. above.

The adverbial phrase *tváyā ... sarátham* "on the same chariot with you" is a variant of *tváyā yujā́* "with you as yokemate" in the 1st vs. of the preceding hymn as well as 4c in this hymn.

X.84.3: Although, as noted above, the final/initial concatenation that prevails in the rest of the hymn does not link vs. 3 with vs. 2, vs. 3 is nonetheless tightly bound to the two preceding vss. Initial *sáhasva* repeats pāda-final *sahasva* in 2a, and vs.-final *śátrūn* repeats *śátrūn* in 2c. Moreover, *ruján* (3b) echoes *ārujántaḥ* (1a) and *préhi* (3b) *abhí prá yantu* (1d).

The VP *sáhasva ... abhímātim* corresponds to the cmpd *abhimātiṣāhá-* in the preceding hymn, X.83.4.

In d both Ge and Re supply a second object in the phrase *váśaṃ nayase*, namely "them" presumably picking up *śátrūn* in b and the subj. of *ā́ rurudhre* in c: "bringst du ... (sie) in deine Macht"; "tu (les) mènes à (la) volonté," with *váśam* an acc. of goal. I instead take *váśam* as adverbial "at will," as I do also in the rt-noun cmpd. *vaśa-nī́-* in X.16.2. See comm. ad loc. and Scar (290). I do not supply an acc. 'them'.

X.84.4: Note the juxtaposition of the semantically polarized terms *éko bahūnā́m* "one/many." The function of the gen. *bahūnā́m* is disputed. With Ge I take it as (an irreg.) gen. agent with *īḍitáḥ*; Ge (n. 4a with suppl. n. 1) cites X.93.4 *nṛṇā́ṃ stutáḥ* as parallel. Re explicitly rejects an agentive reading and tr. "Tu es seul parmi beaucoup ..." (so also Proferes, Sovereignty, p. 18) with a more orthodox use of the genitive. Because of the āmreḍita *víśaṃ-viśam* in the next pāda, I nonetheless favor the agentive interpr.: Manyu performs various services for the many who invoke him. I also can't imagine who "the many" would be who are <u>not</u> being called upon – gods like Indra? other emotional states?

sáṃ śiśādhi echoes *saṃśíśānāḥ* in 1a. There the participle took *ā́yudhā* as object, while here the impv. has *yudháye* as dative of purpose.

On the voc. bahuvrīhi *ákṛtta-ruk*, see, briefly, Scar (459).

On *tváyā yujā́* see comm. ad vs. 1.

On *kṛṇmahe* see comm. ad X.51.7.

X.84.4–5: The final two words of vs. 4 *vijayā́ya kṛṇmahe* are matched by the rt. noun cmpd. *vijeṣa-kṛ́t*, which opens vs. 5. Several remarks about this pairing are in order. First, *vijayā́ya kṛṇmahe* is not a tight syntagm: *kṛṇmahe* has its own direct object (*ghóṣam* 'cry') and *vijayā́ya* is a dative of purpose with the whole predicate. Second, as Scar (80) points out, *vijeṣa-* is not otherwise found in the RV (though it is found non-compounded in AVP V.23.1), though *jeṣá-* is found a couple of times – and, I'd point out, there are *s*-aor. forms *jéṣ(a)-*. Scar considers various possibilities for its formation in this cmpd. (see also Re), but does not mention the clear impetus for its creation: the chaining between 4 and 5. Clearly a nominal form of *vi* √*ji* was wanted as first member of the *-kṛ́-t* cmpd, but simply repeating *vijayá-* is not possible for metrical reasons: **vijaya-kṛ́t* would produce an opening of 4 light syllables (since *-kṛ́d* is followed by a vowel), whereas *vijeṣa-* provides the very desirable heavy second syllable and breaks up the unacceptable sequence of light syllables.

X.84.5: The hapax *anavabravá-* is very difficult to interpr. because the lexeme *áva* √*brū* does not seem otherwise to exist, nor in fact does *áva* plus a verb-of-speaking, like **áva* √*vac* or **áva* √*vad*, in early Vedic. (In the Brāh. *ava* √*vad* is found [e.g., AB V.22] in the apparent sense 'speak ill'; one could also point to *ava* √*man* 'despise', although this lexeme doesn't really show up till Epic/Classical.) Both the context and the preverb *áva* 'down' suggest that the lexeme has a negative value, lit. 'talk/speak down' – with this negative sense reversed by the privative *an-*. The range of available tr. reflects this assumption, but there is otherwise little or no agreement: Gr "von dem man nichts übles sagen kann," Ge "keine Absage [refusal] geben," Re "sans dédire (la promesse)," Scar (80) "untadelig," Wh (AVŚ IV.31.5) "not to be talked down." There are no grounds on which to choose among these. The publ. tr. sticks close to the additive/literal, but assumes that the form is active (so Ge, Re), not passive (so Gr, Scar, Wh). In the publ. tr. the

unexpressed assumption is that Manyu can become our overlord (*adhipā́-*) without verbally demeaning us.

X.84.5–6: The formal concatenation between *ābabhū́tha* (5d) and *ā́bhūti-* (6a) is undeniable; their semantic connection is a different matter. Re explicitly asserts that they have different meanings, and the standard tr. render the verb and the noun differently: Ge "... du entstammst" v. "mit dem Erfolg"; Re "... tu as pris naissance" v. "avec le succès"; Wh (AVŚ IV.31.5–6) "thou camest" v. "with efficacy." Since *ā́bhūti-* is found only here in the RV (and very seldom elsewhere), it is embarrassing to attribute to it a sense different from the juxtaposed verb. Consequently the publ. tr. attempts to unify them: "you came to be ready to hand" and "with readiness." One of the usual senses of verb forms of *ā́ √bhū* is 'come into being', as in the repeated *yáta ābabhū́va* "... from where [this creation] came to be" in the famous creation hymn (X.129.6–7). Our clause, *yáta ābabhū́tha*, matches the X.129 usage exactly, and I would now emend the tr. to "... whence you came into existence." Another sense of *ā́ √bhū* is 'be at hand, be ready', and this is the usual meaning of the rt noun cmpd *ābhū́-* 'standing by, ready at hand, available'; see Scar 359–61. Our isolated *ā́bhūti-* seems to be the abstract 'readiness' corresponding to this rt noun adj.; so approx. also Scar. In this instance the concatenation implicitly contrasts two somewhat different senses of the same lexeme.

X.84.6: On *ā́bhūti-* see immed. above; note that the voc. of another such *-ti*-stem cmpd., *abhibhūte*, is found in the next pāda. The latter is also found in the cmpd. *abhíbhūty-ojas-* in the preceding hymn, X.83.4.

On *sahajā́-* see Scar 148. The first member is presumably the adv. *sahá* 'together with', and this first cmpd member is construed with the instr. *ā́bhutyā*. However, as Scar points out, a connection with *√sah* 'be victorious' is also thinkable, esp. since forms of this root are all over these two hymns, incl. *sáhaḥ* in the next pāda. However, the phrase *krátvā ... sahá* "together with your resolve" in c seems to stabilize *saha-* in *sahajā́-* as the adv.

The sequence *vajra sāyaka, sáhaḥ* is found also in X.83.1, likewise split across a pāda boundary.

The rhyming phrase *med*[t]*y edhi* is phonologically catchy and recalls the repeated *méhi* of the previous hymn (X.83.5, 6). On the meaning of *medín-* see comm. ad X.38.2.

X.84.6–7: The concatenation of these two vss. is phrasal: *(mahā)dhanásya ... saṃsṕji* in 6d matches *sáṃsṛṣṭaṃ dhánam* in 7a.

X.84.7: On *sám √sṛj* see comm. ad X.27.10 and Scar 627–28. My rendering 'pour in' may be a bit over-literal. In 7a spoils that are *sáṃsṛṣṭa-* are contrasted with those that are *samā́kṛta-*. Ge suggests (n. 7a) inanimate and animate respectively; Re's interpr. is more elaborate (see below). Although both *sám √kṛ* and *ā́ √kṛ* are common, *sam-ā́ √kṛ* is quite rare. I take the preverbs as additive – 'bring here [=make (to be) here] together' – and assume that it involves actual collection, whereas *sám √sṛj* may refer to things that have accumulated on their own. This is somewhat like Re's "celui qui s'est déversé (de soi-même) et celui qu'on a poussé (devant soi pour le faire aller) ensemble" – which seems to be the exact opposite of Ge's suggestion. I can't get any further, but I favor something like Re's solution (without the excess verbiage).

I do not understand why the peaceable Varuṇa is brought in at the last minute, to pair with Battle Fury.

X.85–191 From here on till the end of the maṇḍala, the hymns are discrete, arranged (roughly and with a number of exceptions) by decreasing number of verses. See Old, Prol. 228, 237, 240–49.

X.85 Wedding

This long and complex hymn is clearly a composite, as suggested by its length (one of the longest hymns in the RV), the abrupt changes in its tone and subject matter, and its metrical variety. It has been treated by a range of scholars too numerous to mention. Most of its vss. are found in the AV (AVŚ XIV.1–2; AVP XVIII), though not in the same order and with many additional vss. interspersed: the RV version has 47 vss., the Śaunaka AV a total of 139. For my overview of the structure and contents of the RV version see publ. intro.

X.85.1–19: This long preamble treats the mythical wedding of Sūryā, daughter of the Sun, and Soma, who here is identified with the Moon, as in later texts but very rarely in the RV. The structure of this hymn-within-a-hymn is

vss. 1–5 Soma's astronomical qualifications

vss. 6–12 identification of items associated with the wedding with astronomical and other phenomena

vss. 13–16 the pre-wedding: the "wooing"

vss. 17–19 blessings and more astronomy

On the various possible boundaries of this Sūryā hymn, see Old.

X.85.1: This vs. is notable for the parallel hemistich-initial instr. *satyéna* (1a) and *ṛténa* (1c). In keeping with my (perhaps overscrupulous) insistence that *ṛtá-* means 'truth' in the RV (flg. Lüders), not 'cosmic order', 'law', or the like, I tr. *ṛténa* here as 'by truth' and *satyéna* as 'by reality': in much of the RV the adj. *satyá-* means 'real, actual, actually present'. However, I now realize that I must reckon with changing semantics in the late RV, and just as Soma here assumes his later role as the Moon, *satyá-* may here have acquired its later meaning of 'truth', impinging on the semantic domain of *ṛtá-*, while *ṛtá-* may have narrowed its usage to the principle of truth associated with the Ādityas, as is suggested by their presence in pāda c. (See Re's remark, EVP XVI.144, that in Maṇḍala X *ṛtá* "coincides" with *satyá-*.) I would now change the tr. to "By (realized) truth ..., by (immanent) truth ..." – or, more simply, "by truth ... by truth," however against my principles that is.

The next question is why the earth needs to be propped up (*úd*). I have no answer, and it's not a question that seems to have exercised other commentators.

Though underlyingly and overwhelmingly masc., *dyaúḥ* is fem. here (adj. *úttabhitā*), as it tends to be when associated with reliably fem. 'earth'.

The nuance of *tiṣṭhanti* isn't entirely clear to me – perhaps 'take their stand' or 'stand firm'; the other three pādas in the vs. concern the stable position of the entity in question.

Pāda d establishes Soma in heaven and implicitly as a heavenly body.

X.85.2: A major lapse in the publ. tr.: in pāda b "by Soma" should be substituted for "by truth"!

X.85.3: Having established the celestial and cosmic bona fides of Soma, the poet now distinguishes this Soma from the ritual drink.

On the knowledge possessed by 'formulators' (*brahmā́ṇaḥ*) see comm. ad vs. 16.

X.85.4: This vs. develops the thought of vs. 3: that the Soma under discussion here is not the ritual drink, and he therefore can listen to the sound of the pressing stones with equanimity, since he will not be smashed by the stones and consumed.

So much is clear from the 2nd hemistich; the first one presents interpretational difficulties in the two instr. pls., *āchádvidhānaiḥ* (a) and *bā́rhataiḥ* (b) – in both cases the protectors of Soma. The first is a hapax, the second occurs only once in the RV (though it is common elsewhere in Vedic), but their formations are fairly clear: *bā́rhata-* is a vṛddhi deriv. of *bṛhánt-* 'lofty', and the two members of the cmpd. *āchád-vidhāna-* are both found elsewhere. But this doesn't get us very far, nor do the various tr. offered of the cmpd., including the unperspicuous one in the publ. tr. "whose regulation is sheltering." Perhaps the closest to the mark is Doniger's non-literal "by those charged with veiling you." I think this has to do with the phases of the moon. *ví* √*dhā* can refer to temporal regulation, indeed of the moon. Cf. X.138.6 *vidhā́naṃ māsā́m* "the apportioner of the months"; and in our hymn vs. 18 *ṛtū́m̐r anyó vidádhaj jāyate púnaḥ* "The other [=the moon] is born again as he portions out the seasons." The cmpd should be a bahuvrīhi, and I suggest something like "those who have [=oversee] the regulation of (your) covering" or, a bit less awkwardly, "those who regulate your covering" – i.e., whatever forces control the regular covering and uncovering of the moon in its monthly phases. For further on the cmpd. see Scar 129–30.

As for *bā́rhata-* 'those belonging to the heights', this could refer to heaven-dwellers (cf. *bṛhád-diva-*, etc.) or, since the earthly plant soma grows in the mountains, to mountain-dwellers (hapax voc. *bṛhad-giri-*). Since the focus in this hymn is on heavenly Soma, the former is more likely.

In c it is possible that *tiṣṭhasi* + PRES PART is a periphrastic constr., "keep X-ing," though in the standard tr. *tiṣṭhasi* is rendered with its lexical value "you stand, listening ..." The *tiṣṭhanti* in 1c without participle might support the lexical reading, though I am attracted to the periphrasis.

X.85.5: Since the last pāda of the preceding vs. (4d) proclaimed that no earthling consumes Soma, the subject of *prapíbanti* must be other – presumably the gods and, in particular, Vāyu, mentioned in c, who receives the first drink at the Soma Sacrifice.

I take "you swell up again" as a reference to the moon's phases, as I do in 4a.

X.85.6–12: These vss. consist for the most part of bandhus equating parts of Sūryā's wedding chariot and equipage with astronomical phenomena, inter alia. In several instances identification is difficult because of the specialized lexicon. I also think it likely that we are missing a number of astronomical references.

It is a little surprising how many overt copulas are found in these equational clauses. True, they are all preterital, and technically only present-tense copulas are ordinarily gapped. But still I would have thought that once the temporal situation had been established, the preterital copulas could have been dispensed with. The examples are all impf.: sg. *āsīt* (6a, 7c, 8d, 10a, 10b), du. *āstām* (9b, 10c, 11c), pl. *āsan* (8a), and notably the unextended impf. *ā(s)* (7a, 7b). We (linguists) tend to view this form as a precious relic, the expected 3rd sg. impf. to √*as* (*a*+*as*+*t*), which is almost universally replaced by remarking it with the 3rd sg. sec. ending to seṭ roots (-*īt*, as in *ábravīt*). But the RV distribution of *ās* gives me pause: there are 5 exx., all in (late) X and all appearing before vowels, so they appear in sandhi as minimalist *ā* (accented *ā́* once in

X.61.5). These seem to me signs of artificiality, and I suggest that *ā(s)* was reverse-engineered as a kind of parlor trick by linguistically savvy poets. This isn't to say that *ā̆s* / *ās* never existed – it must have, on system-internal grounds and to provide the foundation for *āsīt* – just that it had disappeared by the time of the RV but could be recreated as a pseudo-archaism.

A number of pādas in this sequence are semi-duplicates. I don't know the reason for this – it might just be a taste for repetition, but (more likely in my view) it may be that in various circles there were alternative phrasings of the same general vs. for various stages of the wedding enterprise, and when the hymn was assembled, the assemblers kept the alternative versions. These semi-duplicates include

7d *yád áyāt sūryā̆ pátim*
10d *yád áyāt sūryā̆ gṛhám*
12cd ... *sūryā̆, ... prayatī́ pátim*

8c *sūryā̆yā aśvínā varā̆*
9b *aśvínāstām ubhā̆ varā̆*

10a *máno asyā ána āsīt*
12c *áno manasmáyam sūryā̆ ...*

as well as other, less precise, echoes. There are other such semi-duplications in other sections of the hymn; see below passim.

X.85.6: Raibhī and Nārāśaṃsī are names of particular gāthās that were presumably sung on (or before and after) the wedding journey. The two feminines with which they're equated, *anudéyī* and *nyócanī*, are difficult to identify because of limited attestation: the latter is a hapax and the former almost so. (Fortunately their verbal lexemes, *ánu* √*dā* and *ní* √*uc*, are a bit more secure.) There is a wide range of interpr. of these two terms, which I will not rehearse. On *anudéyī* see my "Inborn Debts of a Brahmin" (JA 302.2 [2014], esp. 248). In my opinion the two feminines refer to servants/attendants of the bride: the *anudéyī* is one from her natal place, lit. 'to be given along with/following (the bride)'. I interpr. *nyócanī* in light of *nyòkas*- '(being) at home' (*ní* √*uc* 'be at home, at ease') and suggest that she is a female servant at the husband's home, who will become the bride's attendant when she comes into the household. This is somewhat similar to Re's suggestions (EVP XVI.144, not Hymnes Spéc.) that *anudéyī* is "qqch. qui est à mettre en place" and *nyócanī* "qqch. qui est d'ores et déjà en place" – though he then immediately claims that they are doubtless parts of the chariot. It is impossible to prove my conjectures (or any of the other suggestions floating out there), but the two suggested meanings are compatible with the verbal lexemes, and they also make the two terms explicitly contrastive, which many of the other suggestions do not.

The standard tr. (Ge, Re [HySpec], WD) take cd as a single clause and as if the verb were a copula. E.g., Ge "Das gute Kleid der Sūryā ist mit der Gāthā ausgeputzt." But d clearly contains *eti*, a verb of motion, which is represented in the publ. tr. ("... goes adorned ..."). Although garments don't ordinarily move on their own, the focus on the wedding journey in this section justifies a verb of motion. The standard rendering seems to be the result of a collective Homeric nod.

X.85.7: The logical connections between the terms in each pair elude me (save for b), though c would make more sense if I interpr. *kóśa-* with most, incl. Gr, Ge , and Wh (AVŚ XIV.1.6), as a traveling chest, cask, or coffer, since the cosmic spaces can be seen as hollow containers, which could be compared to a traveling chest mounted on the wagon and containing the bride's possessions brought from her natal family. I would therefore emend the pub. tr. to 'coffer'.

Pāda d depicts a somewhat different model of the wedding from the one we find later (both later in Vedic and later in the hymn), since the bride Sūryā seems to be traveling by herself to her new husband. Ordinarily the bride's wedding journey is taken in company with her husband after the ceremony, to her new home with his extended family. (See my Sac. Wife 125–26, 223–26.)

X.85.8: As generally rendered, the first pāda refers to parts of the chariot, the second to bridal finery. Because of this mismatch Wh (ad AVŚ XIV.1.8) reasonably suggests the *pratidhā́yaḥ* "must rather be some article of a woman's dress." None of this can be further determined.

X.85.8–9: As disc. in my Sacrificed Wife (221–24), "wooer" (*vará-*) refers not to a hopeful suitor, the future bridegroom, but to his sidekicks, who accompany him to the bride's house to ask her male relatives for her hand and conduct some of the negotiations.

X.85.10: On the *ánas-* 'cart' as the proper vehicle for a bride, see comm. ad I.126.5 and my 2003 "Vedic *vrā́*" (Fs. H-P Schmidt).

Pace Re (HymSpec, fld by Don), the two *śukraú* are far more likely to be the Sun and Moon than the two summer months Śukra and Śuci.

Pāda d is almost identical to 7d.

X.85.11: On the disputed sense of *sāmaná-* see comm. ad III.30.9. Here its usage is complicated by the fact that there is a play on *-sāmā́bhyām* in the preceding pāda. A rendering like "of one accord" fits well here, though it's rather different from what I suggest in III.30.9.

What c is meant to convey baffles me, esp. because of the number disagreement between 'ear' (or perhaps 'hearing') and 'two wheels'. The ear/hearing part fits well with the *ṛ́c-* and *sā́man-* in pāda a, but the wheels are puzzling – though it is the case that wheels can creak in Vedic. Or perhaps ears are here conceived of as circular, with the various articulations of the outer ear seen as the axle and spokes. Given the shape of most ears, they wouldn't provide a smooth ride!

X.85.12: Here at least a dual is equated with the two wheels, but what exactly *śúcī* refers to is unclear. Since an etymologically related dual *śukraú* occurs two vss. previously (10c), they might refer to the same entities. Indeed, Re (HymSpéc, + Don) identify them again as the two summer months. However, perhaps the two oxen and the two wheels ought to be identified with two different pairs — though not necessarily, if these vss. are variants of the type disc. ad 6–12. Re (EVP XVI) points out that *śúcī* is used of Heaven and Earth in X.56.5, and this informed my tentative choice of referents in the publ. tr. However, H+E are not very wheel-like (not that superficial resemblance is guiding the bandhus in this section), so we are back to Sun and Moon, which at least are circular (more so than ears). Ge (n. 12ab) also suggests 'eyes', which would fit the surrounding context better, but I don't think *śúci-* is otherwise so used. On the basis of Sūryā's two wheels in 16 and the regular succession of sun and moon in vss. 18–19, I would now

change the bracketed ident. in the publ. tr. to "[=Sun and Moon]." On the genders of *śukraú* and *śúcī* with further disc. of these passages, see comm. ad X.26.6.

X.85.13: *vahatú-* can mean both 'wedding' and 'wedding procession / journey', in keeping with its etymology (√*vah* 'convey') and with the emphasis on the wedding journey in traditional treatments of ancient Indian marriage; see the reff. given above ad vs. 7. Here either would work.

The locc. *aghā́su* and *árjunyoḥ* refer to nakṣatras; for further see, e.g., Ge (n. 13c), Wh (n. to AVŚ XIV.1.13). The "cows are killed" presumably for the wedding feast.

X.85.14: On the Aśvins as wooers and the use of the mid. part. *pṛchámāna-* see Sac.Wife p. 222.

Pūṣan's appearance and role in d are puzzling. The med. verb *vṛṇīte* in a wedding context is specialized for the bride's choice in a svayaṃvara 'self-choice' marriage. See my 2001 "Rigvedic svayaṃvara" (Fs. Parpola), and for this particular passage p. 306. Elsewhere there are hints that Pūṣan was considered, in certain circles, the husband of Sūryā (see VI.58.4 and comm. ad X.26.6), but even so he should not be the "chooser" (though see the reversal in VI.58.4) and in any case he is choosing his *fathers*, not a spouse. As disc. in the Fs. Parpola art., I think we are dealing with "formulaic slippage": though *avṛṇīta* has the wrong subject and the wrong object, it covertly signals that we're dealing with a self-choice marriage, as Sūryā's marriage is depicted elsewhere in the RV (see Parpola Fs. art. for the evidence).

X.85.14–15: Another semi-duplication: 14ab *yád aśvinā ... áyātam, ... vahatúṃ sūryā́yāḥ* // 15ab *yád áyātam śubhas patī*, *vareyáṃ sūryā́m úpa*.

On the relevance of the questions in cd to the "wooing," see SacWife 222–23.

X.85.16: The question of enigmas and who understands them has been ratcheted up a notch. In vs. 3 the 'formulators' (*brahmā́ṇaḥ*) possessed the esoteric knowledge about the real nature of Soma (*sómaṃ yám brahmā́ṇo vidúḥ*), but here they know only about Sūryā's two wheels, but not the hidden third (*ékaṃ cakráṃ yád guhā́*) – knowledge of which is limited to the *addhātí-*, clearly a more intellectually elite group than mere *brahmán*. The stem *addhātí-*, found only here in the RV though slightly more commonly in the AV, is a *-tí*-stem built to the adverb *addhā́* 'certainly'. As Old points out, the adverb *addhā́* appears several times with forms of √*vid*, so its derivative fits the context here well. Though, per vs. 12, the two wheels are most likely the Sun and Moon, I have no idea what the third wheel is meant to be; Sāy. suggests it's the year (see Ge n. 16). Because of the identification of the two wheels as the Sun and the Moon, since vss. 18–19 portray the regular alternation of sun and moon I would now change the tr. of *ṛtuthā́* in our pāda b to "in their succession."

In order to make the connection between this vs. and vs. 3 clearer, I would now also match the translations of *brahmā́ṇaḥ* in the two vss. The emended tr. of ab should now read "Your two wheels [=Sun and Moon], o Sūryā -- the formulators know them in their succession."

X.85.17: This vs. seems the rough equivalent of a maṅgala vs. and interrupts the semantic connection I see between 16 and 18–19. In a RVic context it reads like a final summary vs., which in this case might bring the first section of the hymn, the mythical marriage of Sūryā, to a close; in that case vss. 18–19 would seem to constitute a loose appendix. AVŚ separates both our 17 and our 18–19 from the other Sūryā materials, which are transmitted together as XIV.1.1–16.

Our X.85.17 is the far distant AVŚ XIV.2.46; our 18–19 less distant, but still separated from the Sūryā vss., as AVŚ XIV.1.23–24.

X.85.18–19: As noted above, these two vss. concern the regular alternation of sun and moon.

X.85.18: The first hemistich treats the two heavenly bodies together, the second contrasts them as separate entities.

In d the participle *vidádhat* is picked up by *ví dadhāti* in the next vs. (19c), as well as echoing the cmpd *āchád-vidhāna-* in 4a, which in my view concerns the phases of the moon (see disc. there), as it does here.

X.85.19: The subject of this vs. is universally considered to be only the moon. I disagree: I think ab concerns the sun, cd the moon. To begin with, it is difficult to apply b to the moon: both "beacon of the days" and "forefront of the dawns" bring to mind not the retreating moon, but the daylight produced by the rising sun. As Ge points out (n. 19b), *áhnāṃ ketú-* is otherwise used of the sun (III.34.4, VI.7.5) or the dawn fire, not the moon. Pāda a is more easily attributed to the moon, esp. since *návo-navaḥ ... jāyamānaḥ* seems a variant of the last words of the preceding vs., *jāyate púnaḥ*, which do describe the moon. But "becomes ever new as he is born" can just as well characterize the sun rising anew every day: both sun and moon are cyclically renewed, just on different timetables.

With cd we return to the moon and its signature verb *ví √dhā*.

X.85.20–27: On the somewhat various contents of these vss., see publ. intro. It's worth noting that 20–23 are found scattered in the AVŚ wedding hymns, but 24–27 occur together (in slightly jumbled order) in AVŚ XIV.1.18–21.

X.85.20: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. may be placed here because Sūryā is addressed in it. It also reprises the mounting (*ā́ roha sūrye*; cf. *sūryā́rohat* 12cd), the *vahátu-* (13a, 14b), the dat. *pátye* (9c; also acc. *pátim* 7d, 12d), and Sūryā's journey in general, as depicted in the Sūryā portion of the hymn.

X.85.21–22: These two vss. are variants of each other in lexicon and content, but in different meters (Triṣṭubh and Anuṣṭubh respectively). The first is found in AVŚ XIV.2.33 (more or less), but the second is not part of the AV marriage suite.

X.85.21: Viśvāvasu is the name of a Gandharva; on the Gandharva as the bride's second supernatural husband (after Soma), see vs.. 40–41.

In c *vyàktām* is usually interpr. as indicating that the girl is post-menarche – though with delicate euphemisms (e.g., Re "pubère," Don "ripe"), but the use of *ví √añj* in vs. 28 invites a more literal interpr. I also think it's a pun: she is not only 'smeared (with menstrual blood)' but also 'adorned', that is, in bridal finery.

In d *sá te bhāgáḥ* looks literally to mean "this [masc.] is your portion," but the preferable "*she* is your portion" is syntactically possible – on the basis of the syntactic rule, esp. well represented in the Brāh., that in equational sentences pronominal forms are attracted into the gender of the equated noun.

X.85.22: On *prapharvī-* see Narten, "Vedisch *prapharvī-*" (Die Sprache 32 [1986] = KlSch 330–39). Acdg. to her it means 'young, unmarried maiden' – referring to a short time-period after puberty but before marriage. She plausibly suggests that it's related to / derived from *phála-* 'fruit'.

X.85.23: The universal interpr. of *anṛkṣará-* is 'thornless', based on a supposed *ṛkṣará-* 'thorn'. As I have argued at length elsewhere ("Thornless Paths and Others: Vedic *anṛkṣara-* : Greek φθείρω," Fs. Rix 1993), there is little or no support for an independent *ṛkṣara-* 'thorn', and I suggested an alternative segmentation *a-nṛ-kṣará-* and an alternative interpr. 'not sweeping men away' (√*kṣar*), 'harmless to men'.

Note the archaic nom. *plural* of *pánthā-*; the AV version (Ś XIV.1.34, P XVIII.4.3) already substitutes the newer form *pánthānas*, which disturbs the meter.

In d I failed to tr. *naḥ*; I would now substitute the tr. "by which our comrades go to woo (her)," with *vareyám* matching the same word in vs. 15.

Aryaman, patron god of marriage, and Bhaga, who represents good fortune, are appropriate deities for the occasion.

X.85.24–27: These vss. treat the wedding ceremony itself, rather cursorily (24–25), the journey to the new home (26), and blessings bestowed on the bride on her arrival (27). This last vs. has the feel of a final vs., and though nearly half the hymn follows, there is an abrupt change of tone and subject after it. These four vss. are also found together in AVŚ (XIV.1.18–21).

X.85.24–25: Another pair of vss. saying much the same thing but in different meters (24 Triṣṭubh, 25 Anuṣṭubh). They are found together in AVŚ (XIV.1.18–19), but in opposite order. The other salient difference between the vss. is that 24 addresses the bride in the 2nd ps., while 25 describes her in the 3rd. On the binding of the bride and her release, see my Sac.Wife 42–48. This action is the equivalent of the Upanayana for women, as Manu says (MDŚ II.67).

X.85.24: As disc. ad III.29.8, suffix-accented *sukṛtá-* has been substantivized and the tr. here should be corrected to "in the world of good work."

X.85.25: The locational designations "from here" (*itáḥ*) and "from yonder" (*amútaḥ*) show that the wedding ceremony is being performed at the bride's natal place (from which she will be "released") before she journeys to her husband's family place, where she will be forever bound. This squares with the treatment of the wedding in the later gṛhya sūtras.

X.85.26–27: The setting of vs. 26 is still the bride's natal place, as shown by *itáḥ* 'from here' in pāda a, but the scene has changed in vs. 27: the 1st word, *ihá* 'here', reinforced by *asmín gṛhé* "in this house," now refers to the husband's domicile. The wedding journey has been accomplished in the meantime. The near and far deictics in this sequence of vss. (25–27) do a lot of the work.

Note also the repetition of the 'house' words and their derivatives in 26c and 27b, each in an alliterative VP: 26c *gṛhā́n gacha gṛhápatnī* (with etym. unrelated [*hasta-*]*gṛ́hya* in 26a) and 27b *gṛhé gā́rhapatyāya jāgṛhi*.

X.85.26: As pointed out by many, Pūṣan is appropriate here because he knows the paths. We saw his association with the Aśvins also in the enigmatic vs. 14.

X.85.28–35: As I say in the publ. intro., "Verses 28-35 are a strange, sinister, and menacing interlude between the generally happy tone of the first part of the hymn and the blessings with which it closes. These, especially vss. 28-30 and 34-35, are also the most discussed and disputed verses in the hymn." As I see it, they treat, in somewhat jumbled order,

vss. 28–30 the deflowering of the bride
vss. 31–33 the wedding journey (which logically precedes the deflowering)
vss. 34–35 the wedding feast (?)

There are many areas of disagreement among the standard tr. and comm.; I will not treat them in detail, but give my own interpr. An outlier among modern interpr. is that of Falk (Fs. Risch), which is imaginative though not ultimately convincing -- but still well worth reading.

X.85.28–30: These are the most challenging vss. in the hymn and, in my opinion, display a very astute sense of the psychological effects of sex -- here presented from the groom's point of view. The three vss. are found together in AVŚ XIV.1.25–27 (in slightly different order).

X.85.28: The bride's garment is stained with blood, as the first word, *nīlalohitám* 'dark red', announces. Although this word is ordinarily taken as a dvandva 'blue (and) red', I think *nīla-* here simply means 'dark' and modifies *-lohitá-*; cf. the bahuvrīhi *nī́la-pṛṣṭha-* 'dark-backed'. The stained garment is of course a sign that the bride was a virgin. This is good news for her relatives (c), since the marriage is proved valid, but by the same token it makes it impossible for the husband to legally escape it: he is "bound in bonds" (d).

This background ambivalence is what I think underlies pāda b, whose subject is, in my view, the bride, not the garment. (See more explicitly in the next vs., 29c *kṛtyaíṣā ... jāyā́*.) As a (newly) sexual being and the husband's sexual partner, she becomes the embodiment of the dark magical hold that sex will exert over him: in the publ. intro. I quote the old American song lyrics "that old black magic" describing women's sexual power, corresponding to *kṛtyā́-* 'witchcraft' in b. This word is found in the RV only in this pair of vss. (28–29), but is quite common in the AV. It's worth noting that in one of the AVŚ hymns against witchcraft, *kṛtyā́-* is compared to "a bride at her wedding" (AVŚ X.1.1 *vahataú vadhū́m iva*).

The other noun in this pāda, *ā́sakti-*, is variously rendered: e.g., Gr Verfolgung (pursuit), Ge Ansteckung (contagion), Re (HymSpec) empreinte (impression, imprint), Wh (AVŚ XIV.1.26) infection, Falk Anhaftung (attachment); see also EWA s.v. *sañj*, etc. Of these, only Falk's seems to reflect the presumed derivation from *ā́* √*sañj* 'hang, fasten on', as in I.191.10 (the venom hymn): *sū́rye viṣám ā́ sajāmi* "I hang the poison on the sun." I take *ā́sakti-* (only in this passage in RV and AV) as an abstract 'hanging' developed into the means of hanging, a noose. Like the bonds in which the husband is bound in d, the wife-as-noose symbolizes the emotional and legal ties in which the husband is now trapped. In the publ. intro. I compare another American English (outdated, one hopes) slang expression, "the old ball-and-chain" for a wife.

The last word in this short pāda, *vy àjyate*, also requires comment, since it can be derived either from √*aj* 'drive' or √*añj* 'anoint'. With most (but see Wh 'is driven away (?)') I strongly favor the latter. The bride is smeared / adorned with the blood of her deflowering; recall the young girl, just past menarche, in vs. 21, *vyàktā-*.

X.85.29: In the first half of this vs. the stained garment, now called a *śāmulyàm*, is disposed of; however useful it was as a sign of the bride's virginity, the blood stains surely make it inauspicious. In b (other) goods are distributed to brahmins, perhaps those who officiated at the wedding or simply bystanders who lend their own auspiciousness to the scene.

The word *śāmulyà-* (or *-ī́-)*, occurring only in this wedding passage, is obviously related to / derived from JB *śāmūla-* 'garment', but there is no good etym.

The second hemistich takes up the plight of the groom again, picking up esp. from 28b. Here (in my view) it is once more said that the bride has become witchcraft -- witchcraft with feet (*padvátī*), i.e., in human form. In d it is paradoxically said that the wife "enters" (*viśate*) the husband, reversing the actual facts of sexual intercourse. But once again this is a psychological, not physical state, and once again American pop culture of a certain vintage offers the perfect correspondence: the 1936 Cole Porter song "I've got you under my skin," which became a signature song for Frank Sinatra. The bride has penetrated the groom's defenses and become part of him, possessed him.

X.85.30: Opinions diverge even further about what's going on this bizarre vs. The crux is found in cd, where the groom seems to be intending to clothe his member in the bride's garment—an act of apparent cross-dressing of stunning oddness, which has provoked interpr. of even greater oddness. But I think I have solved the problem: the garment of the bride (*vadhvò vā́sasā*) is not an actual piece of clothing -- rather it stands for the body of the bride herself. A standard act of sexual intercourse is envisioned (unlike the reversal in 29b). When he puts his penis into her, it is enveloped, enwrapped, by her flesh as if by a tight-fitting piece of clothing -- clothing that reminds us of the stained garment with which this section began.

As for the first hemistich, with his body "glistening in that evil way" (*rúśatī pāpáyāmuyā́*) -- I suggest that the glistening refers to sexual fluids, or perhaps even just sweat produced by energetic intercourse. His loss of splendour (*aśrirā́*) and the evil glistening simply once more refer to his loss of control and autonomy in a sexual relationship. It is good to remember that, throughout ancient Indian culture, giving in to sex entails weakness and loss of power for men, while withholding sex builds power -- all those filmily clad Apsarases seducing great ascetics in the Mahābhārata come to mind.

X.85.31–33: A relatively benign interlude (save for the diseases and the highwaymen) about the wedding journey again. This is out of place, since the deflowering must chronologically follow the trip to the husband's house. These three vss. are not grouped with the equivalent of 28–30 in AVŚ. Instead the equivalent of 31–32 are AVŚ XIV.2.10–11 and 33 = XIV.2.28.

X.85.32: The most natural reading of the first hemistich, followed by all tr. including the publ. tr., takes *dámpatī* in b as the obj. of *vidan* in a. This makes *yé āsī́danti* an unabashed embedded relative clause with finite verb. In a late hymn like this we can expect some loosening of syntactic restrictions, but it is also possible to produce an unembedded reading. The lexeme *ā́ √sad* essentially always has an acc. complement, including occasional personal acc., as in X.142.4 *ā́ tvā ... vásavaḥ sadantu* "Let all the Vasus attend upon you." It is therefore possible to take *dámpatī* primarily with *āsī́danti* and supply it with *vidan*: "Let the highwaymen who beset the married couple not find (them)."

X.85.34–35: In AVŚ the equivalents of these two vss. (AVŚ XIV.1.28–29 [in opposite order]) follow immed. on the equivalents of our 28–30 (AVŚ XIV.1.25–27). This is a more satisfactory arrangement, since the two sets of vss. share a tone of menace and seem to take place in the same general setting (as opposed to the intervening journey vss.). The AVŚ ordering certainly supports the notion that our 31–33 are an intrusion.

Most tr. and comm. consider these vss. to refer still to the stained bridal garment, and the fact that the vss. most likely immediately followed vss. 28–30 strengthens that interpr. The idea is that the inauspicious aspects of the garment are treated and neutralized, and it is then purified and given to a learned brahmin. However, the actions performed on the referent -- eating (or non-eating) in 34b, various types of carving in 35ab -- are hard to square with the interpr. that they are performed on a piece of cloth. I suggest rather that the focus has now shifted to the wedding feast, in particular to the cow(s) killed for this purpose (remember 13c *aghā́su hanyante gā́vaḥ*). True, the referent must be neut., which eliminates 'cow', but *māṃsá-* 'flesh, meat' or *krūrá-* 'bloody (flesh)' would work fine, or even just *ánna-* 'food' (I favor the first). The point is that eating meat unsanctioned by ritual makes it distasteful, even dangerous, esp. for brahmins -- a sentiment we should not find surprising in such a late hymn, as restrictions on meat-eating begin to develop.

What renders the meat fit to consume is "knowing Sūryā" (34c *sūryā́m ... vidyā́t*); this is taken by many to refer to the Sūryā hymn (e.g., Ge "das Sūryā-lied"), that is, as a meta-reference to the hymn we're in the middle of. I find this unlikely, esp. because *sūryā́yāḥ* in the next, paired vs. cannot have such a reference. I think the referential domain is broader -- it's knowing the cosmic significance of the goddess Sūryā and her mythical relation to marriage.

X.85.35: In my view the first hemistich is a graphic depiction of the carving up of the wedding-feast cow, but this violent dismemberment is, in some sense, the public display of the private (sexual) violence just enacted in the bridal chamber (in vss. 28–30). This accounts for pāda c, "behold the forms of Sūryā!" (*sūryā́yāḥ paśya rūpā́ṇi*) -- in other words, "marriage," as represented by Sūryā, is not only the joyful, festive occasion everyone is celebrating, but has its dark and brutal side. Happily it only takes a brahmin (or a learned brahmin) to neutralize the latter. (See comm. ad X.26.6 for speculation that the garments may be included in this purification -- though I am not particularly convinced by my own tentative suggestion there.)

X.85.36ff.: From here until the end of the hymn, the interpr. is fairly straightforward and the tone generally sunny.

X.85.36–41: The speech of the husband, followed by the famous sequence about the previous divine husbands of the bride.

X.85.36: The 1st ps. / 2nd ps. cast of this vs. and the following one seems to connect them with the set of vss. that preceded the dark interlude, esp. 23–27. But it is striking that in the same formula "grasp the hand," the 1st ps. declaration in our vs., *gṛbhṇā́mi te ... hástam*, has the older *bh* form of 'grasp' (√*grabh*), while the compounded gerund *hasta-gṛ́hya* in 26a has the newfangled √*grah* that is only just beginning to creep into usage in the late RV. This suggests that *gṛbhṇā́mi te hástam* is the quotation of a traditional formula, which would not be surprising.

There are other lexical connections between this vs. and 23–27 just mentioned: *saubhagatvā́ya* (a) echoes *subhágā* (25d; also *saúbhāgyam* 33c), *máyā pátyā* (b) *sahá pátyā*

(24d), *yáthā̆saḥ* (b) *yáthā ... ásati* (25cd); *gā̆rhapatyāya* is repeated from 27b. 'Reaching old age' (*jarádaṣṭi-*) is lexically different but semantically similar to *jívrī* 'elderly couple' (27d). And the divine actors, Bhaga, Aryaman, Savitar, Puraṃdhi (36c, with Pūṣan in 37a), are mostly the same: Bhaga and Aryaman in 23c, Savitar 24d, Pūṣan 26a; only Puraṃdhi is absent from the earlier section.

X.85.37: Don renders *śivátamām* proleptically as "rouse her to be most eager to please," which is appealing.

Given the context, my "humans" for *manuṣyā̆ḥ* in b might seem jarring, and inferior to the "men" of the standard tr. (save for Re's lapsus [HymSpéc] "les dieux," which indirectly supports my "humans"). But *manuṣyà-* and related forms are never gender-focused: the contrast is humans/men v. gods, not men v. women. Taking it in its standard sense ("humans") works here because the next vss. concern the previous *non*-human husbands; see *manuṣya-jā̆ḥ* in 40d, of the fourth, human, husband after the first three.

In cd "eagerly" might be better than "willingly."

X.85.39: This vs. presents a minor syntactic problem, which has led to divergence of interpr. By my interpr, cd is a rel. clause hanging off ab, which lacks an overt antecedent to *yáḥ*. It seems to me an easy matter to supply *tásmai* in ab "has given (to him), who ..." -- not an unusual phenomenon in the sometimes loose world of Rigvedic relativization. Other tr. separate ab and cd syntactically. As far as I can see, Ge's interpr. "Langes Leben werde dem, der ihre Gatte ist" is syntactically impossible because it requires taking unaccented *asyāḥ* as the first word of the relative clause. He also appears to be taking *dīrghā̆yuḥ* as a karmadhāraya 'long life', rather than a bahuvrīhi 'having long life', as does Re (fld. by Don). However, the latter two split the hemistich differently, with *dīrghā̆yur asyāḥ* being the first clause and the second beginning with *yáḥ* (Re: "Longue durée de vie soit à elle! Et l'époux, puisse t-il vivre cent automnes!" He simply suppresses the rel. prn.). By this interpr. the long life is the wife's. It is not possible to determine the nature of the cmpd *dīrghā̆yus-* by accentuation: because *dīrghá-*and *ā̆yus-* are accented on the final and initial respectively, *dirghā̆yus-* can have either underlying karmadhār. *dīrgha-ā̆yus-* or bahuvr. *dīrghá-āyus-* accent. However it's worth noting that essentially all the other *dīrgha-* cmpds in the RV (rt. noun *dīrgha-śrút-* is a bit of an outlier) are bahuvr. and that both the other two occurrrences of *dīrghā̆yus-* (IV.15.9–10) and the lone voc. *dīrghāyo* (stem *-āyu-*) (VIII.70.7) are bahuvrīhis. I thus favor the bahuvr. analysis, which is reflected in the publ. tr.

X.85.41: The contrast between *dadat* (a, b) and *adāt* (c) is noteworthy and the reason not clear to me -- though the augm. aor. may cast this action as the recent past (see also the near deictic *imā̆m* referring to the wife) as opposed to the further past of ab. The publ. tr. reflects this. Redupl. *dadat* itself is something of a mystery: though it should belong to the redupl. pres. *dádāti*, it can't be a straightforward injunctive, which should of course be **dadāt*. Interestingly, injunctives to the redupl. stem with long root vowel (i.e., the type **dadāt*) are not attested, though imperfects of the type *adadāt* are. The slot is filled by forms like this, which look like thematizations, but which are probably old short-vowel subjunctives, reinterpr. as injunctives. Hoffmann (Injunc. 134 n. 53) tries to claim that the type *dadat* is always subjunctive, but that's not possible here, since the sequence ends with the augmented *adāt* in c.

X.85.42–47: Generalized blessings and good wishes posing no rhetorical challenges.

X.85.43: The almost featureless god Prajāpati, who has a great future ahead in Middle Vedic, only begins to make his appearance in the late RV. Here he enables an etymological figure: *prajā́m janayatu prajā́patiḥ*.

Pl. *naḥ* 'for us' presumably refers to the whole extended family, not to the dual married couple.

ádurmaṅgalīḥ picks up *sumaṅgalī́ḥ* in 33a.

X.85.44: *devákāma-*: a bahuvr. that can mean either 'loving the gods' < 'having love for the gods' (approx., objective genitive) or 'having the love of the gods' (i.e., loved by the gods) (subjective genitive). Renou does it the latter way: "aimée des dieux," though most, incl. the publ. tr., go for the former. But given the fact that the gods are asked to provide blessings – and the fact that god-loving piety (in the mode of later bhakti) isn't particularly characteristic of Vedic religion, perhaps Renou is right.

X.85.45: The first hemistich ends with *kṛṇu*, the second with *kṛdhi*. Although ingenious arguments could be constructed to explain the use of metrically equivalent 2nd sg. act impvs. to the pres. and aor. stems respectively, I think this would be taking ingenuity too far.

The phrase "her husband the eleventh" is probably not an indication that her immature husband is going to behave for the rest of his life like an overgrown teenager, lounging around playing video games and eating pizza while she indulges him. Rather it probably reflects the notion, commonly expressed later, that the husband enters his wife's womb and is reborn as a son.

X.85.47: The actors in the last hemistich, Mātariśvan, Dhātar, and (fem.) Deṣṭrī, do not figure in the standard wedding line-up. Mātariśvan is ordinarily the fire-bringer or fire itself, later wind. None of these roles overlaps significantly with the wedding. Dhātar "the Placer / Disposer" is at least in early Vedic an abstract sum of his derivation: agent noun to √*dhā*. Deṣṭrī is only found here in the RV, though she occurs several times in the AV (P V.26.5, VI.19.2, XII.11.3, XVI.22.2 [=Ś XI.4.12], XVI.108.6 [=Ś X.10.17]), XIX.42.7, but nowhere in an absolutely clarifying context. In the AV she is associated with the *vaśā* cow and also with female divinities associated with fertility, esp. Sinīvālī, which may help explain her presence here. In fact, the earliest attestation of Sinīvālī, in RV II.32.6 (q.v.), may help explain our vs. In that vs., Sinīvālī is urged to "apportion offspring to us" (*prajā́ṃ devi <u>didiḍḍhi</u> naḥ*), with an impv. to the root √*diś*, of which *déṣṭrī-* is the fem. agent noun. The Deṣṭrī here may be the goddess who assigns/apportions children to prospective parents, while the masc. Dhātar ('placer') is responsible for the actual placement of the embryo in the womb: see X.184.1 *dhātā́ gárbhaṃ dadhātu te* "let the Placer place the embryo in you" (followed by a vs. in which Sinīvālī is urged to do the same). Deṣṭrī the Assigner and Dhātar the Placer may work in tandem in creating offspring for the married couple, which would explain their prominent presence in the last vs. of the wedding hymn. With this new interpr. of Deṣṭrī's function I would change the tr. from "... the Disposer ... the Director" to "... the Placer ... the Assigner."

Why Mātariśvan is here is less clear; perhaps in his role as wind, he represents the life breath of the child-to-be. On Mātariśvan as breath, see AVP XVI.22.5 = AVŚ XI.4.15.

X.86 Vṛṣākapi

This justly famous hymn consists of a sometimes raunchy dialogue between Indra, his wife Indrāṇī, and a monkey (Vṛṣākapi). It has received a vast range of interpr.; besides the standard, see Re, Hymnes spec.; Don; Schnaus, Dialoglieder. I tr. and discussed it at length in SacWife (74–88), where I introduced my own interpr. of the hymn as reflecting a mock-Aśvamedha (see also publ. intro.). I will not reproduce all this disc. here, though I still strongly believe it, nor engage in detail with other interpr.

X.86.1–23: All 23 vss. of this hymn end with the refrain *víśvasmād indra úttaraḥ* "Above all Indra!" Since there are many places in this hymn in which Indra's fortunes seem to be at a low ebb (starting with vs. 1), the refrain can sometimes seem out of place. But if the hymn depicts an Aśvamedha for Indra, all actions would ultimately glorify him.

X.86.1–2: In SacWife (p. 76) I suggest that these first two vss. represent the year-long journey of the Aśvamedha horse before it returns to be sacrificed.

X.86.1: The standard interpr. ascribe this vs. to Indrāṇī, but I think it makes more sense in the mouth of Indra, esp. the ref. to *mátsakhā* 'my comrade' identifying Vṛṣākapi.

Because *ásṛkṣata* (a) is accented and *amaṃsata* (b) is not, the domain of *hí* is only pāda a, with b the main clause, a syntactic distinction that is elided in some tr.

In *vṛṣā́kapi-* both the accent and the length of the stem vowel of the 1st member are anomalous. Assuming the 1st member is *vṛ́ṣan-* 'bull(ish)', the 2nd-syllable accentuation deviates from its base form (rather like the troublesome simplex *víśva-* versus cmpded *viśvá-*), and 1st-member accentuation for a tatpuruṣa is also unusual. For description / recognition of these issues, without real explanation, see, e.g., AiG II.1.42, 251 (with Nachtr. 73), 266 and KH, Aufs. 356.

The thieving, intoxicated Vṛṣākapi is reminiscent of the monkeys drunkenly wrecking the grove in Rāmāyaṇa V.59–61.

X.86.2: Here I follow the general view that Indrāṇī speaks this vs. She is trying to match Indra's rhetoric, which may account for the unusual use of *hí* in the first hemistich, matching his *hí* in 1a. Her *anyátra* also echoes his *yátra* in 1c.

X.86.3: There are various ways to construe the parts of this vs., esp. pāda d. I (and others) take d as an afterthought disjunctive object to *cakā́ra*, parallel to the more important *tvā́m* in pāda a. Positioning it as a sort of appendix to the rest of the sentence not only downplays its importance (as I just suggested), but also reinforces the structural parallelism of this dialogue: 1d <u>*aryáḥ*</u> <u>*puṣṭéṣu*</u> <u>*mát*</u>*sakhā* is partly matched by 3d <u>*aryó*</u> *vā* <u>*puṣṭi*</u>-<u>*mát*</u> *vásu*. JC pointed out the *mát* immediately following *puṣṭí-* in both pādas but with quite different grammatical identities.

The pāda-final sequence *u nú* in c is a close mirror-image of pāda-initial *ná ū* in 2c.

X.86.3–4: The rhetorical matching is esp. tight at the beginning of these two vss.:

3a. *kím ayám tvā́m vṛṣā́kapiḥ*

4a *yám imám tvám vṛṣā́kapim*

Note also that forms of *vṛṣā́kapi-* are found in all 4 vss. so far, 3x at the end of an odd pāda (1c, 3a, 4a), once at the beg. of an even one (2b).

X.86.5: The rhetorical echoes continue, linking 4 and 5: the first word *priyā́* picks up *priyám* at the beginning of 4b; pāda-final *kapíḥ* (a) matches the three previous pāda-final (*vṛṣā́-)kapi-* (1c, 3a, 4a); the c pādas are structurally the same:

4c *śᵘvā n̲ᵘ́ asya jambhiṣat*

5c *śíro n̲ᵘ́ asya rāviṣam*

This rhetorical template may explain why the sigmatic aor. of √*ru*, an apparent aniṭ root (ppl. *rutá-*; see EWA s.v. *RAV*²), shows up here as an *-iṣ*-aor. This is the only verb form to the root in the RV; however, it must be admitted that there are other seṭ forms, including aor. *rāviṣṭa* in a widespread mantra in Vedic prose. See Narten 225.

The root √*duṣ* 'spoil' can be used elsewhere in Vedic and later for specifically sexual misbehavior.

X.86.6: Indrāṇī's boasting about her sexual prowess may seem jarring; in fact scholars like Thieme (see SacWife p. 278 n. 156) deny that Indrāṇī, the wife of the great god Indra, could speak like this and assign the vs. elsewhere. But there is a precise analogue in the Aśvamedha -- when the chief wife lies down with the dead horse and speaks a verse that contains the complaint *ná mā yabhati káś cana* "no one at all is fucking me," while her female entourage is engaging in sexual banter with the priests (see SacWife 78–79 for the comparison with our vss. here; 66–72 for the fuller Aśvamedha script).

On the style of Indrāṇī's speech, see comm. ad vs. 7.

On *-yāśu-* see comm. ad I.126.6.

X.86.7: This is the first vs. spoken by Vṛṣākapi, and it is in a markedly lower register than the dialogue so far -- even vs. 6, which, though vulgar in content, is morphologically and syntactically elevated: Indrāṇī punctiliously distinguishes between the primary and secondary comparative and uses the injunctive (/subjunctive *bhuvat*) against Vṛṣākapi's finite future *bhaviṣyáti*.

In addition to this verb form (finite futures being relatively rare and late-ish in the RV), other signs of the register difference are the intimate and informal voc. *amba* (twice), the popular/diminutivized voc. *sulābhike* to the *l*-form of √*rabh* (√*labh* being late and rare in the RV; see comm. ad X.87.8), and the use of *iva* to qualify a verb, not mark a simile -- also surely the initial *uvé*, whatever it may be (see below). My tr. tries to represent the abrupt register shift; in most of the standard tr. Vṛṣākapi might as well be speaking like an Oxbridge don.

The initial word of the vs. *uvé*, found only here in Skt., is disputed: the leading contenders are the older one, that it is an exclamation/interjection, or what is probably the current one, that it is the 1st sg. of a verb √*u* 'see' (= Hittite *au-/u-* 'see'). I share the latter view. See EWA s.v. *uvé* (with lit.) and LIV s.v. **h₁eu̯*. However Kloekhorst in his 2008 *Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (p. 229) disputes this connection, in part because the meaning of the hapax *uvé* cannot be independently verified, and he revives the exclamatory explanation. He fails to cite the Pkt. (Ardhamāgadhī) *ua(ha)* 'see!' adduced by W. P. Schmid, whose sense is pretty clear and which supports the interpr. of *uvé* here as a verb 'I see'. On the Pkt. form, esp. the apparent thematic *-a-*, see v. Hinüber *Überblick* §430. That the only Indic correspondent to RV *uvé* is found in Pkt. is another indication that Vṛṣākapi's speech is low register.

X.86.8: Indra, the speaker, seems to be trying to wrench the discourse back up to a higher level. Though Indrāṇī's physical charms continue to be praised, the adjectives are quite decorous -- see Thieme's demonstration (1985: 244) that they correspond almost uncannily to descriptors of Greek goddesses. Closer to home, the phrase *subāhúḥ svaṅguríḥ* modifies the minor goddess Sinīvalī in II.32.7, who appears with Indrāṇī in the last vs. of that hymn (II.32.8). Note the *r*-form of the 'finger' word, *aṅgúri-*, against parallel *aṅgúla-* — perhaps an indication of the elevating of the discourse; stronger evidence is the cmpd *pṕthu-ṣṭu-* 'broad-braided', a truncated form of *pṕthu-ṣṭuka-*, which characterizes Sinīvalī in the hymn just cited (II.32.6). The word for 'braid' is simply *stúkā-*; there is no evidence that it's a diminutive or popularly suffixed form, but Indra seems to be reacting to Vṛṣākapi's *sulābhike* by lopping off what he may have perceived as the "low" suffix *-ka-*. EWA calls *pṕthu-ṣṭu-* a false archaism.

X.86.9: On the suffix *-āru-* in *śarā́ru-* see comm. ad III.30.8. As for the word itself, JC (diss. 2023: 83–84) cleverly suggests that the word means 'horny' (in the English sexual slang sense) and is yet another deriv. of the IE stem **ḱer-h₂-* 'head, horn', extensively disc. by Nussbaum 1986. For derivational details, see JC's disc. I would now emend the tr. to "this horny creature ..."

On the possible double sense of *abhí √man*, both 'have designs on' and 'disrespect', see comm. ad X.27.11.

X.86.10–11: Most tr. and comm. assign these next two vss. to Vṛṣākapi and his supposed wife Vṛṣākapāyī respectively. I very much doubt the existence of a separate figure Vṛṣākapāyī, as I discuss in SacWife (pp. 81–82); for my interpr. of the voc. *vṛ́ṣākapāyi* in 13a, see comm. below. And I find it difficult to believe that after his slangy informal speech in vs. 7, Vṛṣākapi could so easily code-switch to the solemn hieratic diction of vs. 10. Instead, as disc. in the publ. intro., I think 10–11 are spoken by the narrator, who affirms Indrāṇī's exalted status -- not only as Indra's wife, but as the central figure of the ritual, the Aśvamedha, that will ensure Indra's prosperity and long, indeed unbounded, life. In other words, after the vulgar and unseemly sexual squabbling between Indrāṇī and Vṛṣākapi (the "sacrificed horse" figure), we are reminded that it was all in service of the greater good and that we should glorify Indrāṇī for her (selfless) act.

X.86.10: The standard tr. and comm. take this vs. as temporally unified: the glorification of Indrāṇī (cd) happens/happened at the gatherings depicted in ab. I instead think her habitual past behavior (ab) is contrasted with her exaltation now (cd). In the past she went to and participated, as Patnī, in the normal recurrent rituals (perhaps the Patnīsaṃyajas), but at the Aśvamedha she has taken on a much more central role, allowing her to be magnified (*mahīyate*) not only as the possessor of a hero (*vīríṇī*) and one whose husband is Indra (*índrapatnī*), but as the "Adept of Truth" (*vedhā́ ṛtásya*), an august Indo-Iranian title, here surprisingly applied to a female. (For further disc. see SacWife p. 80 and nn. 160, 161.)

X.86.11: The tone of solemn celebration continues here. Note the fronted name *indrāṇī́m* and the 1st person aorist *aśravam* "I have heard of Indrāṇī (as) ...," which has an archaic and ceremonial air. The 1st ps. speaker is the poet/narrator, by my interpr. For similar phraseology, cf. IV.39.6 *dadhikrā́vṇo akāriṣam* "I have celebrated Dadhikrāvan." Or, for that matter, I.32.1 *índrasya nú vīryā̆ṇi prá vocam*, etc.

I do not understand who "these women" (*āsú nā́riṣu*) are. Perhaps Indrāṇī's female attendants at the Aśvamedha, or -- more likely -- (all) women here on earth?

X.86.12–14: In my view, all three of these vss. are spoken by Indra. (The standard view assigns 13 to Vṛṣākapi.) In 12 Indra laments the loss of his friend -- who (again in my view) has now been sacrificed and is going, in the form of an oblation, to the gods. But the happy result of this sacrifice is indicated in 13–14: Indra is once again receiving abundant offerings, after the hiatus noted in the first hemistich of the first vs. of this hymn. I take this to be the direct result of the successful Aśvamedha. On these vss. see SacWife (81–82).

X.86.12: Note that two of the words used to describe Vṛṣākapi in the opening of the hymn—*sákhi-* (1b) and *priyá-* (4b)—recur here.

The pronom. adj. *idám* qualifying *havíḥ* suggests that the sacrifice is happening here and now.

On "watery" (*ápya-*) see disc. in SacWife (pp. 278–79 n. 165).

X.86.13: The voc. *vṛ́ṣākapāyi* that opens this vs. is singlehandedly responsible for sending so many interpr. off the rails. A figure, Mrs. Vṛṣākapi, has to be invented for it, and she then needs to have things to do and vss. assigned to her to speak -- even though there is otherwise no evidence for her existence, her actions, or her words. Within my Aśvamedha model there is a simple explanation that avoids these unconvincing excursions: because Indrāṇī has copulated with the (now dead) monkey, Indra can address her as "wife of Vṛṣākapi," right after he addressed her as Indrāṇī in 12a. Ritually she fills both roles, and it is in her role as (temporary) wife of Vṛṣākapi that she has brought about the rich feast of oxen on which Indra will gorge himself, as well as providing herself with good progeny.

X.86.14: On *kukṣī́* as 'cheeks', see comm. ad X.28.2, etc.

X.86.15: This vs. reaffirms that soma is being offered to Indra again, in implicit answer to 1a *ví … sotór ásṛkṣata* "they have left off pressing (soma)." For the evidence that soma is referred to here (*pace* most interpr., who seem willfully to misinterpr. the words), see SacWife (82–83). Most assign this vs. to the wife of Vṛṣākapi. I am inclined to think that it belongs to the narrator, but if the 2nd ps. address to Indra calls that into question, I would suggest Indrāṇī as alternative.

X.86.16–17: These two verbally responsive and sexually explicit vss. carry the message of the hymn, in my view. See disc. in the publ. intro. and SacWife (83–84). The first of them expresses what might seem to be a self-evident statement: the sexually successful male dominates ("is master" *īśe*). This is what in later Sanskrit might be called the *pūrvapakṣa*. The following vs. exactly reverses the statements of the first: all the words in the same order are found in both; only *ná séśe* "he is not master" and *séd īśe* "just he is master" are flipped, each acting as main clause to the other relative clause. This second statement is counterintuitive: the sexually *un*successful male is the one who dominates. We can see this as the *siddhānta*, in later terms. And it is fitting and perfectly appropriate exactly in the Aśvamedha: the king and sacrificer stands aside, impotently, while his wife copulates with another (a horse, as it happens). But the horse is killed: sacrificed and offered to the gods -- much good its sexual "success" did it! And

the sexually inactive king receives all the benefits of the sacrifice and his power and dominance significantly increase after an Aśvamedha.

This pair of vss. is the climax of the hymn; the remaining vss. seem like an appendix, with 19–22 forming a little group that treats the year-long travels of the animal-to-be-sacrificed that chronologically precedes the action of the rest of the hymn.

X.86.18: On this vs. see my disc. in SacWife (84–85). Flg. Old (somewhat contra v. Schroeder), I interpr. it with ref. to charm for virility in AVŚ (VI.72) in which a *párasvant-* with an esp. big penis serves as model. In a sense this vs. summarizes the ritual in advance: Vṛṣākapi finds ritual paraphernalia and a slaughtered animal that represents virility, just as he will, likewise slaughtered, at the end of the ritual involving him. This vs. introduces the journey vss. 19–24.

X.86.19–24: As indicated above, I believe these vss. describe Vṛṣākapi traversing the year-long circuit prescribed for the horse in the Aśvamedha. This journey was briefly alluded to in vss. 1–2. Vṛṣākapi (vs. 19) embarks on his journey with a noble purpose: to distinguish between Ārya and Dāsa, between wise and foolish -- establishing the boundaries, as the Aśvamedha horse does in the later ritual, between "our" domain and that of outsiders. In the succeeding vss. Indra and Indrāṇī attempt to lure him back to his fate.

X.86.19: Most assign this vs. to Indra, but it then has little or no narrative connection with what follows. See disc. SacWife (85 and n. 175).

X.86.20: Pāda a contains an "X and which Y" construction, which I have not represented in tr. As JSK points out (DGRV I.135), we should have expected the order ... *yác *ca kṛntátram*. On *kṛntátra-* see comm. ad X.27.23, where I suggest 'cleft' would be better than 'chasm' here.

Since the pl. of *gṛhá-* is often used to refer to a single homestead (presumably consisting of a number of buildings), this could also be tr. "to the nearer house."

X.86.21: With most I assign this vs. to Indrāṇī, adding her encouragement to the preceding vs. (20), which I think Indra speaks. There is sinister ambiguity in everything she says. Although superficially it sounds like an enthusiastic "welcome home," promising delights on Vṛṣākapi's return, under the surface it alludes to Vṛṣākapi's impending sacrifice and death.

To begin with, the 1st du subjunctive *kalpayāvahai* can be either inclusive (I and you = Vṛṣākapi) or exclusive. In the former case she's suggesting that she and Vṛṣākapi can together arrange pleasures for each other. In the latter case, the other subject would obviously be Indra, her husband and, perhaps more important, the Yajamāna of this Aśvamedha. The obj., *suvitá-* 'easy going, easy passage', is reminiscent of *sugá-*, which we met in 5d. And more to the point the same *sugá-* is found in a telling passage in the RV Aśvamedha hymn, at the moment when the horse is put to death, with the death and the subsequent journey to the gods euphemistically expressed: I.162.21 *ná vā́ u etán mriyase ná riṣyasi*, *devā́m̐ íd eṣi <u>pathíbhiḥ sugébhiḥ</u>* "You do not die nor are you harmed. You go to the gods along <u>easygoing paths.</u>" In our pāda b it certainly sounds as if Indra and Indrāṇī would arrange similar paths for Vṛṣākapi. This impression is strengthened by the last pāda, *ástam éṣi <u>pathā́</u> púnaḥ* "you go home again <u>along the path</u>" -- *eṣi <u>path</u>* [INSTR] being exactly the expression in I.162.21. Here 'home' can stand for 'heaven / the gods'.

Even the cmpd *svapna-náṃśana-* can be read doubly. If *náṃśana-* belongs to √*naś* 'disappear / perish, (transitive) destroy', 'sleep-destroying' could be read as Indrāṇī's invitation to Vṛṣākapi to continue their sexual relationship, but if to √*naś* 'attain', with 'sleep' = 'death', it can identify Vṛṣākapi as one about to attain his final "sleep."

X.86.22: The last of the journey vss. The grammatical puzzle it poses, not evident in tr., is that, though only two entities are addressed, Vṛṣākapi and Indra, the 2nd ps. verb (*ajagantana*) is plural, as is the adj. modifying the subjects, *údañcaḥ*. I discuss this in SacWife (86 and n. 178) without finding a satisfactory answer. Perhaps, Indrāṇī is an unexpressed third, or perhaps all the victims of the Aśvamedha are included.

I do think the vs. refers both to the sacrificial procedure and to the death journey. The directional adj. *údañc-* can mean both 'northward' and 'upward': the latter can refer to the same journey to the gods in heaven as I suggest for vs. 21. As for the former, as I point out in SacWife, the place where the horse is killed in the Aśvamedha is north of the Mahāvedi, and it is led there just before the killing. The same double sense may be found in *-yopana-*. It can be a pun on *yū́pa-*, the post to which sacrificial animals are tied. But a form of √*yup* is found in one of the funeral hymns, X.18.2, where the living turn away from the dead and take up their lives again: *mṛtyóḥ padáṃ yopáyantaḥ* "effacing the footprint of death."

I don't quite know why the last hemistich is framed as questions, but perhaps the uncertainty created by the double reading is the reason.

Note the *l*-form *pulu-* for standard *puru-*. It may be telling that the only other occurrence of *pulu-* is at the end of another dialogue hymn, I.179 (Agastya and Lopāmudrā), whose vs. 5 contains the cmpd *pulu-kā́ma-* 'having many desires'.

X.86.23: This vs. notoriously has no obvious connection to the rest of the hymn. However, there are some verbals echoes with other parts of the hymn (see SacWife 86–87). More important, the prodigious fertility of Manu's wife in this vs. resonates with at least one of the aims of the later Aśvamedha, namely to remedy childlessness and produce sons (as at the beginning of the Rāmāyaṇa).

For disc. of the larger Indo-European context of this vs., see Watkins (Dragon, p. 53).

X.87 Agni Demon-smiter

Not surprisingly given the subject matter, both recensions of the AV contain versions of this hymn: AVŚ VIII.3 and AVP XVI.6, with somewhat different vs. orders.

X.87.1: The hymn opens with the word 'demon-smiter' (#*rakṣoháṇam*), setting the tone for what follows. As if to contrast Agni's roles, or to soften the effect of that first word, the second pāda opens with the oppositional *mitrám* 'ally (➔ friend)'.

Re rejects 'sprinkle' for *ā́ jigharmi* in favor of his 'attirer à soi'—on which see my objections ad X.6.4. He claims that the context doesn't favor 'sprinkle' here, but rousing Agni to smite demons requires kindling him and, indeed, producing a roaring fire. The ritual sprinkling (with ghee) in this first vs. readies Agni for his aggressive actions in the rest of the hymn.

On *mū́ra-deva-* see comm. ad VII.104.24. I realize that the alternative interpr. 'having roots as gods' is given some support in this hymn by the occurrence of *mū́la-* 'root' in 10d (and possibly *sahámūra-* in 19c), but I still find this alternative unlikely.

X.87.2: This vs. nicely depicts a sequence of actions involving Agni's mouth, The sequence is set up by the first word in the vs., *áyo-daṃṣṭraḥ* 'having metal jaws': first he "brushes / touches" the foes with his flame (ab), his flame often being likened to his tongue; then he "seizes" them with his tongue (c), and finally puts them in his mouth (d).

The root affiliation of *vṛktvī́* is disputed: Old and Wack favor √*vraśc* 'hew', while most (incl. the publ. tr.) opt for √*vṛj* 'twist, wrench'. Because of the mouth imagery, I find 'hew' unlikely.

X.87.3: Given the continuing focus on Agni's mouth, Sāy's equation of *ubhayāvin-* as *ubhayā́-dant-*, reflected in all the standard tr., seems correct, even though in its other occurrence in VIII.1.2 it has a more general sense. The point here is to contrast Agni as predator animal with peaceable ruminant *paśu*-s like cows that have teeth in only one jaw.

X.87.4: As Lub convincingly argues ad AVP V.8.4, the evidence of the Paippalāda demonstrates that *śalyá-* means 'tip, point' of an arrow, not the shaft. Given this, *aśáni-* in the same pāda should not also mean '(arrow) point'. Ge takes *aśáni-* as whetstone here: "die Pfeilspitzen (wie) an Schleifsteinen streichend." But √*dih* 'smear' is an odd action to perform with a whetstone, esp. if poison is what is being smeared. Better to take *aśánibhiḥ* as an instr. of accompaniment, indicating a different if similar weapon -- quite likely slingstones for a slingshot. I would now emend the tr. to "smearing their tips, along with slingstones ..." Both sharp projectiles would "pierce" their targets and introduce poison into their bodies.

X.87.5: Notice *bhindhi* in pāda a, echoing *bhaṅdhi* in 4d.

If *aśáni-* is 'slingstone' in 4, it must be here as well: I emend the tr. to "Let the murderous slingstone smite him ..." Although "with its blaze" (*hárasā*) might seem inappropriate to a slingstone (or an arrow point), we should keep in mind that it is Agni / fire that lies behind all these weapons. *háras-* is quite common in this hymn: vss. 5, 10=14, 16, 25. For further on this word, see comm. ad X.16.7.

In the special register of this hymn, it can be hard to determine the particular nuances of lexemes found elsewhere, and *ví* √*ci* is no exception. Ge "verstreuen," Re "sépare (ses membres) déchiré(s)." Although I think Re is in some ways closer to the mark, the problem with his rendering is signaled by the final parenthesis "(s)," sneakily making the singular obj. *vṛknám* into a plural that can be separated into parts. My own "open up" is based on the use of *ví* √*ci* for clearing / opening up paths. See comm. ad I.90.4. After hewing apart the body, the aggressor pulls it apart to get to the bloody flesh.

X.87.6: The *yád* opening c is pleonastic, functionally doubling the *yátra* that opens the vs.; it also provides a useful prop for enclitic *vā*.

X.87.7: Whether what is recovered is inanimate (my "what was seized") or animate (most other tr., e.g., Klein [DGRV I.390] "... the one seized ... from the sorcerer seizing (him)") cannot be determined from *ā́labdham* -- nor does it really matter.

As Re points out, the *l*-forms *ā́labdha-* and *ālebhāná-* contrast with the *r*-forms of the same lexeme in vss. 2 and 8: *ā́* (...) *rabhasva*. Besides the two forms in this vs., there is only one other occurrence of √*labh* in the RV, also in the late Xth Maṇḍala (X.130.7) -- though see the fem. voc. *sulābhike* in the immediately preceding Vṛṣākapi hymn (X.86.7).

The phonologically marked animal name *kṣvíṅka-* occurs only here in the RV, though it is marginally attested in the BYV Saṃhitās as well as in the AV versions of our hymn. A carrion-eating bird of some sort makes contextual sense.

X.87.8: Unlike the rest of the hymn, where Agni is urged to perform direct violent actions, here in the first hemistich he is asked to "proclaim" (*prá brūhi*) who the sorcerer is, in a quasi-legalistic way -- though direct action returns in the 2nd hemistich. This brief switch to the verbal may prefigure the emphasis on the deceptive, untruthful qualities of the foe in some of the following vss.: 9d, 11b, 12d, 13ab, 15.

The theme of true and false speech may also be indirectly reflected in the use of the epithet *nṛcákṣas-* 'having his eye on men' in this section: 8d, 9d, 10a (and 17b), since this cmpd is often used of gods, esp. Sūrya, witnessing (and then judging) the behavior of mortals. Because the other three occurrences of *nṛcákṣas-* in this hymn clearly modify Agni, the genitive in the phrase in d, *nṛcákṣasaś cákṣuṣe* most likely refers to Agni too (so explicitly Ge and Re), even though it would be awkwardly coreferential with the implicit 2nd sg. subj. of the impv. *randhaya*: "(O Agni,) make him subject to the eye/gaze of the one [=you] with his eye on men." However, it is possible that this instance actually refers to the Sun, with whom Agni is then conflated in the next vss.

X.87.9: The re-use of *cákṣus-* from 8d, clearly identifying Agni's eye, supports the standard view that the *cákṣus-* in 8d is also Agni's, despite my comm. above.

The ambiguity of value of the root √*rakṣ* is on full display in this vs. On the one hand Agni is urged to *rakṣ* the sacrifice (pāda a), but his enemies are identified as *rákṣas-* in c (and 10a).

X.87.10: Ge (n. 10b, fld by Re) plausibly suggests that the phrase "three points" (or "tops") *trī́ṇi ... agrā́* actually represents "top, middle, and root," as in III.30.17 *úd vṛha rákṣaḥ sahámūlam indra, vṛścā́ mádhyam práty agrám śṛṇīhi* "Tear out the demonic power, root and all, Indra; cleave its middle; shatter its top." Note that our passage contains two of the three verbs in III.30.17: *śṛṇīhi* (2x) and *vṛśca*.

X.87.11: *sphūrjáyan* is the only form of this root in the RV, though it occurs later. Here it phonologically anticipates *śaphārújam* in 12b and *dhū́rvantam* in 12d. For a recent etymological proposal see comm. ad X.46.5.

X.87.12: On the formation of *śaphārúj-* see comm. ad X.44.9. As there, I would here consider an alternative tr. 'breaking with the hoof/hooves'.

X.87.13: Pādas a through c each identify a different kind of speech that Agni can weaponize in d. The coreferential pronoun *táyā* in d simply picks up the last of these, fem. *yā́* in c.

The *vācás tṛṣṭám* "harshness of speech" uttered by the *rebhā́ḥ* supports my interpr. of *rebhá-* as 'hoarse-voiced', against the standard anodyne 'singer'. See comm. ad VI.3.6, etc.

X.87.14–15: All four pādas of 14 and the first of 15 begin *párā*, which is echoed by the first word of 15b *pratyág*. The 1st three pādas of 14 also have the same verb, 2nd sg. impv. *śṛṇīhi* (which should also be supplied in d), and the first pāda of 15 has the 3rd pl. equivalent *śṛṇantu*.

On *mū́ra-deva-* see vs. 2 above.

X.87.15: As noted in the publ. intro., this is one of two vss. that lack direct address to Agni and grant other gods a piece of the action.

Both √*śap* 'curse' and *tṛṣṭá-* 'harsh' are reprised from 13ab, here construed together.

X.87.16: The standard tr. take *áśvyena páśunā* as referring to two entities: "horse (flesh) and cow('s flesh)," while I take it as single, with *áśvya-* modifying *páśu-*.

X.87.17: The root affiliation and meaning of the desid. *títṛpsa-* are unclear. On the one hand, the only root √*tṛp* with a full repertoire of forms, including verbal forms, is √*tṛp* 'be satisfied / satiated'; √*tṛp* 'steal' is confined to the root noun, found in cmpds like *paśu-tṛp-* 'cattle-stealing', *asu-tṛ́p-* 'life-stealing'. On the other hand, an instance of the latter cmpd is found in our 14d, which sets up the presumption that a verb form containing this root syllable three vss. later should belong to the same root. Moreover, Ge (n. 17c) points out that √*tṛp* 'be satisfied' generally takes a gen. complement, not the acc. found here. And indeed Ge and Re, as well as Heenen (p. 150), interpr. *títṛpsāt* as 'seeks to steal', in contrast to Wh (AV VIII.3.16 "would fain enjoy"). The publ. tr. takes it as a pun, an interpr. I still think is correct.

X.87.18: The second hemistich brings another pair of pāda-initial *párā*, like vss. 14–15.

X.87.19: The cmpd *sahámūra-* potentially connects with two different pieces of this hymn. The 2nd member *-mūra-* is phonologically identical to the 1st member of *mū́ra-deva-* in 2c (on which see comm. ad loc.). As noted there, I take the *mū́ra-* in *mū́ra-deva-* with *mūrá-* 'dumb, doltish'; others, however, consider it an *r*-form of *mū́la-* 'root'. At least with regard to the cmpd in this vs., that is a reasonable hypothesis, for *sahá-mūra-* has a doublet *sahá-mūla-* in III.30.17, a passage quoted above ad vs. 10. Vs. 10 contains simplex *mū́la-*, referring to the base or foundation of the sorcerer, which should be ripped out ("rooted out," in the English phrase). I think that is the primary sense of the cmpd *sahámūra-* in our vs.: Agni is supposed to destroy the sorcerers entirely, "root and all." But I also think that the use of the *r*-form deliberately evokes *mū́ra-deva-* in 2c: destroy the sorcerers along with their foolish (gods). Note that *sahámūrān kravyā́daḥ* in our vs. echoes *mū́radevān ... kravyā́daḥ* in 2cd.

X.87.21: After pāda a, which is an abbreviation of 20ab, this vs. is structured by a series of etymological dyads: *kavíḥ kā́vyena* (b), *sákhe sákhāyam* and *ajáro jarimṇé* (both c), *mártāṁ ámartyaḥ* (d).

The verse is characterized by the absence of the imaginative violence urged on Agni in the rest of the hymn. In particular, "as a poet with your poetic skill" is a far cry from the hewing apart, burning up, and eviscerating that Agni has engaged in earlier in the hymn (and later).

X.87.22: As in 21b, we find Agni in his role of poet (here *vípra-*). In both passages Agni-the-poet is conceived of as a protective enclosure (*pári*).

On *bhaṅgurā́-vant-* see comm. ad VII.104.7.

X.87.24: On *kimīdín-* see comm. ad VII.104.2.

Once again Agni as poet (*vipra*), and in this vs. "we" also figure in that role.

X.88 Sūrya and Vaiśvānara

On the structure and contents of the hymn see publ. intro. However, that introduction fails to note explicitly that the hymn has an omphalos structure. The central sequence of verses, 8–13, all contain the formula "the gods begot Agni" (vss. 8, 9, 10, 13) or variants (11, 12). Although this sequence is not enclosed by supporting rings, its weight is sufficient to support an omphalos interpretation.

X.88.1: The first hemistich of this vs. is straightforward syntactically and semantically, but the elements in the second hemistich can (and have been) construed in a variety of different ways. Among the questions are 1) are *bhármaṇe* and *dhármaṇe* syntactically parallel, and if so are they infinitives? 2) if either or both is/are infinitives, is *tásya* to be taken as subj. or obj. of one or both? 3) what is the syntactic function of dat. *bhúvanāya*? 4) whose *svadhā́-* is in question? 5) is *paprathanta* injunctive or subjunctive, and in either case is it transitive (with *-anta* replacement) or a medial intransitive contrasting with the well-established transitive active? 6) If transitive, what is its object? The answers to these questions crucially affect what cosmic situation we think is depicted. I will not explore the various, quite distinct, answers that have been given (besides Ge, Re [EVP XIV], Old, see also, for ex., Kü 320 and Köhler [RV *kavi* 117, 131–32]), but will simply detail my own interpr. -- which does not agree in its entirety with any other, though it does agree with some on a number of points.

In my interpr. the two *-maṇe* forms are parallel infinitives, whose logical subject is *tásya*, referring to Agni. Their object is *bhúvanāya* 'world', which has been attracted into the dative by its governing infinitives. The *svadhā́* is the gods', since it's closer to their verb *paprathanta* than to words relating to Agni. The verb is an injunctive, referring to cosmic origins; it is transitive and takes a gapped acc. *bhúvanam* as object (i.e., the same word that has been attracted into the dative [see above]). (On these thematic-looking pf. forms, see comm. ad VII.86.1. They are otherwise act.; our form must be an *-anta* replacement, since real middle forms of √*prath* are normally intrans.) As I interpret it, the point is that in the beginning the gods spread out the world by their inherent power, but it is now Agni's responsibility to maintain it (through the ritual associated with him).

X.88.2: The second hemistich begins with *tásya* and ends with *asya*, both with the same referent, namely Agni. Re takes them as contrastive: "de cet (Agni) là, de cet (Agni) ci," But this seems unlikely: if the first form were meant to refer to the celestial, distant Agni, we should expect a form of *asaú*, viz. gen. *amúṣya*. Ge's (n. 2cd) explanation of the doubling as tautological is more persuasive. In fact *tásya* is in the standard position for an anaphoric *sá* / *tám* form, and it is doubled by *asya* adjacent to the noun on which it's dependent (*sakhyé*). This doubling might be an argument against taking *tásya* in 1c with *svadháyā* in 1d, since, to match 2cd, we might have expected an *asya* in 1d close to its noun.

X.88.3: On the clash of gender and deixis in *pṛthivī́ṃ dyā́m utémā́m*, see comm. ad VIII.40.8d. The phrase is repeated in vs. 9.

X.88.4: I take the subj. of *samā́ñjan* in d to be the gods at the primal installation of the ritual fire, when they chose (*vṛṇānā́ḥ*) Agni as their Hotar -- *pace* Re, who supplies "prêtres," presumably

referring to human priests. This action of the gods is in harmony with my interpr. of 1cd, where I suggest that the gods, having spread out the world in the beginning, left it in Agni's charge.

On neut. *sthā́(ḥ)* in this formula, see comm. ad I.10.14.

X.88.5–6: In these vss. Agni first *stands* "*at /on* the head of the world" (*bhúvanasya mūrdhán* 5a) and then "*becomes* the head of the world" (*mūrdhā́ bhavaḥ* 6a). I take the first to refer to the location of the fire on the ritual ground and the second, of course, to the fire itself. Agni is elsewhere referred to as "the head of heaven"; see disc. ad X.125.7. That Agni becomes the head of the world "by night" (*náktam*) in vs. 6 results from the lack of competition from the sun during the night; the sun's appearance in the early morning presumably dethrones Agni from his exclusive position.

X.88.5: The two clauses of the 2nd hemistich imply that our ritual praise of Agni was necessary to enable him to become *yajñíyaḥ*.

X.88.6: The standard tr. (see also Köhler, Kavi 118) take *tátaḥ* as "from him [=Agni]"; even though Ge's parallel (n. 6b) from AB VIII.28.13 *agner vā ādityo jāyate* is telling, I think the source here is left vaguer.

The acc. phrase in c, *māyā́m* ..., needs a governing verb; "behold, see" seems reasonable on the basis of passages like X.55.5 *devásya paśya kā́vyam* ... See Ge n. 6c.

As always, *māyā́-* is difficult: 'uncanny power' might be a good alternate to 'artful contrivance' here.

The referent of d is not specified, and as far as I can see, it could be Agni or Sūrya -- or both, though some identify it specifically as Agni (Gr s.v. *tū́rṇi-*, Re; neither Ge nor Old weighs in). Although I think both are probably meant, the description fits Sūrya somewhat better. As disc. ad III.11.3, 5, I now think that *tū́rṇi-* is a synonym of *taráṇi-* and derived from √*tṝ*. The basic meaning of *taráṇi-* seems to be 'transiting' (e.g., I.50.4), used of the sun journeying across the sky. The same sense fits nicely here, and I would replace the publ. tr. with "that he pursues his work as he transits, knowing the way." This can secondarily be applied to Agni, who is qualified as *tū́rṇi-* (III.11.5) and *taráṇi-* (I.128.6, etc.) 'advancing'.

X.88.7: "Whose womb is in heaven" (*divíyoni-*) of Agni seems a mirror image to the birth of Sūrya from Agni or his general environs in the immed. preceding vs. (6b).

The morphological identity and referent of *tanūpā́ḥ* have elicited more dissension than seems warranted. The question is whether it modifies the gods (*devā́ḥ*) or the oblation *(havíḥ*), with the former position taken by Sāy., Gr, Re, and the publ. tr., the latter by Ge and Köhler (Kavi 118, 333), while Old and Scar (305) consider both options, though Old leans towards *havíḥ*. The ending *-ā́ḥ* speaks for nom. pl. m., though admittedly the rare neut. sg. to root nouns in *-ā́-* seems to take the masc. *-s* ending: see comm. ad VII.8.6. However, Ge's (n. 7d) invocation of X.61.1 is no support: his attempt to make *maṃhaneṣṭhā́ḥ* in that passage a neut. sg. is quite dubious; see comm. ad loc. The contextual argument for taking *tanūpā́ḥ* as modifying *havíḥ* rests on the next vs., which contains a masc. sg. phrase *yajñáḥ ... tanūpā́ḥ* -- the thought being that if the sacrifice in that vs. is *tanūpā́-*, then the oblation in the previous vs. must be too. But I see no problem with a conceptual evolution: the gods being *tanūpā́-* transfer this quality to the sacrifice that they create. In fact the evolution is expressed by the first hemistich of the next vs., 8ab.

X.88.8–13: On these verses as an omphalos, see intro. above.

X.88.8–10: The impfs. *ajanayanta* (8b), *ájanayanta* (9a) and aor. *ájījanan* (10b) have the same subject (gods) and object (Agni) and appear to refer to the same long-past event; there is no "aoristic" coloring of the third verb. The only syntactic difference is that *ájanayanta* in 9 is in a rel. cl., but this should not condition a difference in tense/aspect stem (and doesn't in 8b). In this particular case, the two forms seem to be interchangeable. The medial ending *-anta* is of course an *-anta* replacement (see my 1979 IIJ article), functionally equivalent to an active. Cf. act. *ajanayan* in 13b, again with the same subj. and obj. referring to the same event.

X.88.8: In c Ge (n. 8c) takes sg. *sá* as attraction to the number of the predicate *yajñáḥ* but representing a plural -- so notionally "*these* became their sacrifice" -- a construction that would follow the practice of Vedic prose in nominal clauses. Although I think the three elements that the gods created in ab do go into making the sacrifice of c, I'm not sure we need to invoke this syntactic rule, since a summary "this" would work as well. By contrast Re takes *sá* as referring to Agni: "C'est (Agni) protecteur de nos corps qui est devenu pour eux le sacrifice (même)." Since Agni is only one of the elements that the gods create in ab, this seems to violate the logical structure of the vs. -- though admittedly in subsequent verses it is only Agni that they beget.

Note that the last phrase in the vs., *tám ā́paḥ*, somewhat echoes *tanūpā́ḥ* closing pāda c, as well as 7d.

X.88.9: *bhúvana-*, which earlier in the hymn is sg. and means 'world' (vss. 1, 2, 5; see also 12a), here transitions to pl. 'beings, creatures' (also vss. 11, 16).

On *pṛthivī́ṃ dyā́m utémā́m*, see above ad vs. 3.

X.88.10: Köhler (35) identifies this vs. as an omphalos vs., referring back to the 1st vs. and forward to the end of the hymn, vss. 18–19. As indicated above, I think the omphalos is more expansive.

There are a few points of difference between the various interpr. of ab. Ge (fld. by Scar 334) construes *diví devā́saḥ* (a) together as "die Götter im Himmel," whereas I (with Re and Köhler 334) construe *diví* with *ájījanan*, referring to the location where the gods created Agni. That *diví devā́saḥ* is found in the next vs. (10d), where it must refer to the gods' placement (*ádadhuḥ*) of Agni in heaven (so also Ge), supports my (/ Re's / Kö's) interpr., as does the cmpd. *divíyoni-* 'whose womb is in heaven' used of Agni in 7b.

Another question of deployment of an adjunct involves *śáktibhiḥ*. Ge construes it with *rodasiprā́m* "der mit seinen Kräften die Welt erfüllt," while Re, Scar, Kö, and I assign the powers to the gods. Since *rodasiprā́-* is found in 5d without an instr., it seems likely that the same usage of this root noun cmpd is found here, and their powers are what the gods use to create Agni.

Gr, Ge, and Re take *bhuvé* in the phrase *bhuvé kám* as an infinitive: more or less "made him <u>to become</u> threefold." But "to become" seems pleonastic; I prefer (with Kö) to interpr. "for the world," which anticipates the fuller *víśvasmai ... bhúvanāya* "for the sake of the whole world" in 12a. I do acknowledge, however, that *kám* appears twice elsewhere in the hymn with an infinitival dative: 1d *dhármaṇe kám* "to support" and 18d *vidmáne kám* "to know."

The threefold nature of fire encompasses the sun, lightning, and the earthly fire, acdg. to Ge (n. 10c), but it could in addition (or even instead) refer to the three ritual fires.

X.88.11–14: The phrases *bhúvanāni víśvā* "all living beings" (11d) and *víśvasmai ... bhúvanāya* "for the whole world" (12a) trigger the suite of repetitions of Agni's *vaiśvānara-* in 12b, 13a, 14a.

X.88.13: The negated pres. part. *áminant-* occurs here without expressed object. I supply *daívyāni vratā́ni* "divine commandments," on the basis of I.92.12=I.124.2 (both of Dawn), where the neut. acc. pl. phrase is object of *áminatī*. Ge (n. 13c) supplies *díśaḥ* 'directions' as object on the basis of I.124.3, while noting *vratá-* as a possible alternative. Both possible objects are found frequently with √*mī* and both here would indicate that Agni Vaiśvānara moves unerringly. With *vratá-* as object, the expression would indicate that though he wanders (*cariṣṇú*), he moves the way he's supposed to, not contrary to the cosmic order. Supplying *díśaḥ* produces much the same result: he doesn't confuse the direction he's supposed to go in.

X.88.15: This vs. has been much discussed, seeming as it does (perhaps misleadingly) to refer to the *devayā́na* and *pitṛyā́na*, already found in the RV and important conceptually later. One of the problems confronting such an interpretation for this passage is that in this vs. there are two routes (*dvé srutī́*) but three genitives: *pitṝṇā́m* (a), *devā́nām utá mártyānām* (b). Given the formulaic nature of "gods and mortals" and the separation of this phrase from the gen. of 'forefathers', it is hard to match the Pitars and the gods with the two paths and sideline the mortals. The disposition of the three genitives and its theological implications are much discussed (see Ge's long n. 15, Old, etc.). I follow Ge (and Köhler 335) in construing *pitṝṇā́m* with *aśṛṇavam*, as the source of my information, not as owners of either path. Since the Pitars are explicitly asked for esoteric cosmic knowledge in 18c, this seems reasonable. I have no particular views on the nature or ownership of the paths.

X.88.16: Vs.-initial *dvé*, matching *dvé* opening vs. 15, invites the identification of the two entities, with the two routes of 15a referred to here as well. But this is not the standard view: Ge takes *dvé* as Heaven and Earth, Re, similarly, the two cosmic masses, and it is the case that the du. adj. *samīcī́* can have such a reference; see, e.g., III.30.11, VIII.6.17. Moreover, since H+E appear in the last pāda of the preceding vs. (as Father and Mother) and since the vs. seems to concern Agni as the Sun making his daily transit (cf. *taráṇiḥ* in d), the two world halves make sense as defining the space through which he journeys. But I would not rule out a reference to the routes of vs. 14, esp. since one can conceive of the Sun traveling along a fixed route. Perhaps the two routes in this vs. are the (visible) one from east to west and the opposite, unseen one from west to east that brings the Sun back to his starting point.

Pāda b seems deliberately obscure. The root affiliation of the 2nd ppl., *vímṛṣṭa-*, is uncertain: it could belong to either √*mṛś* 'touch' or √*mṛj* 'wipe', which in this lexeme are in fact semantically quite close. With Gr, Ge, Re, etc., I take it to √*mṛś*. However, unlike them I would insist on the literal meaning of the root, not a watered-down mental equivalent (e.g., Re's "scruté-distinctivement"). On this lexeme and its literal interpr., see disc. ad X.65.7.

Pāda c is almost identical to II.3.1, of Agni, as Ge points out (n. 16c), while *taráṇir bhrā́jamānaḥ* (d) is found in VII.63.4b of Sūrya (Ge's n. 16d). The hemistich thus captures the dual identity of Agni in this hymn.

X.88.17–19: On these vss. and esp. the participants in the dialogue, see publ. intro. As disc. there, I consider the dialogue to be at first between Heaven and Earth, who have figured prominently in the past few vss. and who are spatially identified by *ávaraḥ páraś ca* "the lower and the higher" (17a). The standard view (in addition to Ge, Re, Old, see Scar 289 n. 408, Kö 336) is that the participants are two priests on the ritual ground, on the basis esp. of 19cd. Although these interpr. discount the implicit vertical axis of *ávaraḥ páraś ca* in favor of "nearer and further," the vertical orientation is clear in the related phrase *avástāt ... parástāt* in 14d; see also *ávaraṃ páraṃ ca* in the immed. preceding hymn (X.87.3). As indicated in the publ. intro., I think the participants silently morph into the priests found in 19cd. This would fit the oscillation between the divine primordial instantiation of the sacrifice and its present-day performance of it that structures the rest of the hymn.

X.88.17: My interpr. of this vs. differs significantly from the standard in another respect: I consider the two clauses in cd between the *kátaraḥ* question in b and the *káḥ* question in d also to be questions. In other words, everything from 17b through 18b belongs to the question sequence, even though the *ā́ śekur* clause in 17c and the *nákṣanta* clause in 17d do not contain explicit interrogatives. These two questions, with the subject *sákhayaḥ* 'comrades', concern the success both of the gods in their original creation of the sacrifice and the priests who perform it now.

X.88.18: As Sāy. already pointed out (see Ge n. 18ab), the answer to these *káti* questions -- "one" -- is given in the Vāl. hymn VIII.58.2.

The impossible hapax *upaspíj-* has received more than its share of attention. Its general sense and tone are clear: it refers to a frivolous or insulting question. Its phonological similarity to *sphíj- / sphigī́-* 'buttocks' suggests something in the latter, rude or contemptuous, realm. In addition to the lit. cited in EWA s.v., see Scar (664–65) and more recently J. T. Katz, "The Riddle of the *sp(h)ij-*: The Greek Sphinx and Her Indic and Indo-European Background" (in Pinault and Petit, eds., *La langue poétique indo-européenne*, 2006). Katz takes it as a dvandva "lap-buttock" (*upa(s)-sp(h)ij-*) referring to a trick or double-sided question. Like most attempts at etymologizing this word, it is more clever than persuasive.

X.88.19: As indicated in the publ. tr., I think this vs. asserts that the (daily) performance of sacrifice will continue as long as the cycles of the natural world do -- an assertion that may be esp. important to establish the neologistic *brāhmaṇa* priest as an eternal figure.

Ge somewhat perversely takes *ná* as the negative here despite being in a position strongly associated with the simile particle and in fact in the same phrase in VI.50.8 *uṣáso ná prátikam*, where Ge does take it as a simile marker. No other interpr. follow his lead.

The fem. pl. adj. *suparnyàḥ* surely refers to Agni's flames, as is generally agreed. The question is why it is feminine. I think the ref. is to metaphorical mares, as in IX.86.36 *harítaḥ suparṇyàḥ* "fine-feathered golden mares," there used of soma drops.

The flames "clothe themselves as if in the face of Dawn" because flames are red-gold like the dawn sky.

X.89 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., this is an old-fashioned well-made hymn, making use of familiar rhetorical devices like patterned repetition: e.g., the negatives in 6ab, the pāda-initial perfects in 7, the preverb *prá* in 8cd–9ab and again in 11, *índraḥ* + GENITIVES in 10, *ánu* in 13.

X.89.1: Instead of *stavā* the Pp reads *stava*, which Old pronounces (persuasively) "wahrscheinlich falsch." As disc. in the publ. intro. this hymn almost self-consciously locates itself in the IIr. praise-hymn tradition and would follow the convention of the annunciatory 1st ps. at the beginning of a hymn (as in I.32.1a *índrasya nú vīryā̆ṇi prá vocam*) – here 1st sg. subj. *stavā*. Note that, as in I.32.1, Indra is the first word of the hymn: *índram stavā*.

Pādas a and d end with the alternative instr. *mahnā̆* and *mahitvā̆*; I render them both as 'greatness', as I don't think the poet is attempting to draw a semantic distinction, but simply reacting to different metrical circumstances (disyllabic v. trisyllabic cadence end) and perhaps aiming for variety.

With Ge (n. 1c) I take *várobhiḥ* as referring to the dimensions of the worlds, not of Indra; see IV.21.8 *várāṃsi párvatasya*. As Ge points out, 2a supports this interpr.

X.89.2: At first glance the sun (in pāda a) and Indra (b) appear to be identified, since both appear in the nom. and there is only one overt verb – so Old (flg. Bergaigne). However, this makes for both syntactic and conceptual problems in the rest of the vs. My interpr. is similar to Ge's: I take a and b as separate clauses, and supply an intrans. form of √*vṛt* with *pári* in a, partly matching the trans. idiom *ā̆* √*vṛt* in b. The object of this transitive verb is then found in c, which describes, without naming, the sun of a in the acc. In other words, the sun is doing its daily circuit in pāda a, and Indra is urged to turn the sun more in our direction in bc. The simile of Indra's turning chariot wheels is, of course, quite apt, given the sun's circular shape.

X.89.3: Old suggests that *arca* is a misunderstanding for **arcā*, matching *stavā* in 1a, and Ge tr. as a 1st sg. subj. without comment. So also Scar (508 with n. 708). Yet I see no reason not to take it as the 2nd sg. impv. it appears to be, as an ex. of poetic self-address.

Although *samānám* can modify *bráhma* in the following pāda (and is so taken by Gr, Ge, and Scar), I do not see why a formulation chanted by a single person and directed at a single god would be 'common' or 'joint' (e.g., Ge "das gemeinsame Erbauungswort"; he thinks it's held in common by the group of singers [n. 3a]). I prefer to take it as a neut. adv. 'in the same way', contrasting with *návyam* 'new', in the usual Rigvedic productive paradox concerning praise poetry, that it is both traditional and new. The word also phonologically resembles, and so contrasts with, negated *ásamam* 'without equal'.

The root noun cmpd *ánapāvṛt* is potentially multivalent syntactically: it can be an adv. (as the other occurrence in V.32.5 is, in my view; see comm. ad loc.), or it can modify either the subj., i.e., the chanter, or the formulation. With Ge and Scar (508), I take it with the last: the formulation that goes directly, without swerving, to its goal, the god Indra, but the other possibilities cannot be ruled out.

The expression *kṣmayā̆ diváḥ* seems to show the same case disharmony as is found in paired temporal expressions like *divā̆ náktam* "by day and by night." Scar (508 n. 708) tentatively suggests rather that it is underlyingly *kṣmayā̆ *divā̆ u*, with matching instrumentals, and means "mit der Erde und mit dem Himmel nicht zu vergleichen." But this seems overfussy; moreover it unnecessarily deprecates the formulation in question: that is, it implies that the formulation cannot be compared to H+E and is therefore not as good – but why would it be compared to them in the first place?

Our *ví yáḥ pṛṣṭhéva jánimāni aryáḥ ... cikā̆ya ....* is very like IV.2.11 *... cinavad ví ..., pṛṣṭhéva vītā̆ vṛjinā̆ ca mártān* "he will distinguish ... like backs, straight and crooked, (like)

mortals" (a parallel that is generally remarked on). Although the owners of the backs under comparison are not identified, I assume that they are horses (so also Ge) and that Indra is being presented as, in the first instance, a judge of horseflesh. Note that though our passage lacks "straight and crooked," *vṛjinā́* 'crooked' appears in 8b. Th. (Fremdling 64–68) disputes this interpr. of *pṛṣṭhá-* and derives it instead from √*praś* 'ask', with the meaning Rätselfrage, for both our passage and IV.2.11: "Welcher Indra gesondert hat (=auseinander kennt) wie Rätselfragen die Ursprünge des Fremdlings, keinen Freund sich wünscht." Although this is clever and the morphological derivation itself is unimpeachable, it is unnecessary, and he still must reckon with numerous undoubted exx. of *pṛṣṭhá-* 'back'.

X.89.4: The bahuvrīhi *ániśita-sarga-* 'having restless surges' echoes the phrase *átiṣṭhantam apasyàṃ ná sárgam* "like a busy surge that never stands still" in 2c. I consider *ániśitasargā apáḥ* in our vs. to be an unmarked simile (so also Ge) matching the explicit simile in 2a.

There is phonetic play between *-sargā(ḥ)* (a) and *ságarasya* (b).

As Ge points out (n. 4ab), "the depths of the sea" can refer to the heart, the source of poetic inspiration, as in IV.58.5 (cf. 11) *hṛ́dyāt samudrā́t*, etc.

The wheels in c (*cakríyā*) pick up those in 2b *cakrā́*. I suggest that the pf. *cikā́ya* in 3d phonologically mediates between these two, esp. resembling *cakríyā* with flips of vowel quality and quantity.

X.89.5: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. seems intentionally designed to mislead. The subj. of the hymn is of course Indra, whose name has appeared in all four of the previous vss. in prominent pāda-initial position (1a #*índram*, 2b #*índraḥ*, 3d #*índraḥ*, 4a #*índrāya*). The string of nom. sg. masc. descriptors in 5ab invites the audience to assume the same referent, esp. since 4cd has Indra (though unnamed) in the nom. as well. But when we reach the beginning of the 2nd hemistich we find instead #*sómaḥ*, and we must scramble to shift the adjectives of the 1st hemistich to this new referent. The adjectives are in fact applicable to both referents, though with slight adjustments of sense. For ex., the hapax bahuvr. *ā́pānta-manyu-* if applied to Indra would mean 'deriving battle-fury from the drink', whereas Soma 'provides battle-fury in/from his drink'.

The first member of the next hapax cmpd *tṛpála-prabharman-*, *tṛpála-*, is found independently in IX.97.8, modifying *manyú-* (which precedes it here). See comm. ad loc., where I accept Mayr's tentative connection to *tṛprá-*, found only once in RV (VIII.2.5; see comm. ad loc.), characterizing soma, but also occasionally later. With Mayr I tentatively take *tṛprá-* to mean 'sharp', a well-known quality of soma (though usually expressed by *tīvrá-*), an interpr. supported by some later Iranian evidence. The second member, *prábharman-*, is found independently (along with other nominal derivatives and numerous exx. of the verbal lexeme *prá* √*bhṛ*), referring to the presentation of ritual offerings. My "first impression" is a bit loose; Ge's "Anstich" (first draught) is better, capturing the *pra* while maintaining the physical quality of the soma offering.

The adjectives in b are less rarified than those in pāda a, and the first and last (*dhúni-* 'boisterous' and *ṛjīṣín-* 'possessing the silvery drink') are frequently applied to Indra. In fact *ṛjīṣín-* is overwhelmingly an Indra word – applied to soma only once elsewhere (VIII.79.4). So just before introducing Soma as the subject, we get a qualifier that seems (misleadingly) to clinch the Indra reference.

The construction of the second hemistich is unclear. Ge takes c as an independent clause, which requires him to supply, indeed invent, a verb (wiegt ... auf 'outweigh'). Not only is there no support for this verb, but having *sómaḥ* lean forward into a new clause diminishes the drama of the surprise introduction of this subject for the expected Indra. I therefore take *sómaḥ* as the enjambed final word of the nominal clause of ab, with a new clause (comprising the rest of c along with d) starting immediately after. The syntactic isolation of *sómaḥ* allows the referent switch to reverberate. This suggested disposition of the hemistich is essentially that of Ludwig's (see Old's disc. and partial endorsement). The neut. pl. phrase *víśvāny atasā́ vánāni* "all the [other] bushes and trees," subject of *debhuḥ*, is picked up by *pratimā́nāni* 'counterparts, equivalents' in d as a sort of secondary predicate. Although Old hesitates somewhat to accept Ludwig's interpr. because of the "etwas harte Satzteilung," note that there has to be a pāda-internal clause break in the next vs., 6b.

As Ge points out (n. 5d), this indicates that already in the (late) RV there may have been ritual substitutes for the soma plant – however we interpr. the syntax of cd.

There is some debate about the meaning and function of *arvā́k*. Ge (flg. Ludwig) interprets it first as locational 'below' and then by metaphorical extension 'lesser'; Old in addition suggests temporal 'until now'. I take it in its standard sense 'nearby', here characterizing *pratimā́nāni*.

My only hesitation about the interpretation of the hemistich championed here is that it involves an "all ... did not" construction (*víśvāni ... ná .... debhuḥ* "they all did not deceive ..."). Some time ago I made a study of the interaction of quantifiers and negatives in Vedic (which I thought I had published long ago but evidently did not) in order to assess the scope of the quantifier in such contests (total "all do not" versus partial "not all do"). In the RV there are essentially no examples of *víśva-* / *sárva-* plus *ná*; the only apparent exceptions involve the All Gods (*víśve devā́ḥ*) (see, e.g., III.32.8), where the "total" interpr. is the only one possible, since the All Gods are a corporate entity and could not participate in a "not all do" construction. In the AV the apparent restriction against such constructions is slightly loosened, but they are still quite rare; early Vedic prose has a few more, but it still seems to be avoided. In positing an "all do not" reading here, I would point out that this is a late hymn; moreover the sequestering of the "all" phrase in pāda c, taken up by a non-quantified *pratimā́nāni* in d and with the neg. opening d, may have made the construction acceptable: "All the bushes and trees – (as) near counterparts, they do not deceive ..."

X.89.6: The first hemistich consists of a rel. clause (*ná yásya ...*) that lacks not only a finite verb but any predicate at all, followed by brief main clause: *sómo akṣā́ḥ*. These two words cannot belong to the rel. cl. because the verb is unaccented. As was just noted, the mid-pāda clause break here supports the similar interpr. of 5cd.

As to the predicate in the rel. cl., Ge supplies a verb "gewachsen sind," with no justification given; in fact in n. 6ab he suggests importing *pratimā́nāni* from 5d, as does Old -- and the publ. tr. concurs. There is a subtle shift in sense, however: in 5cd the bushes and trees were not quite counterparts / equivalents of soma; here no cosmic geographical features are counterparts / equivalents of Indra.

I am taking *yásya* as referring to Indra; though both Old and Ge consider soma another possible referent, they both seem to opt for Indra, and he seems the only possible one to me. To knit the two clauses together we should expect *tásmai* or *índrāya* to begin the main clause.

Ge (see also Kulikov 142) takes cd as a single cl. dependent on the main cl. of b. This is certainly possible but it requires seeing *manyúḥ* as the subj. of the two verbs in d, *śṛṇā́ti* and *rujáti*. I prefer to interpr. cd as another depend. cl. (c) / main clause (d) dyad, with Indra as the subj. of the two main cl. verbs, which are accented because each is initial in its claus(ette) and *śṛṇā́ti* is also init. in its pāda. This interpr. means that the pres. part. *adhinīyámānaḥ* is predicated in the c-clause. Kulikov (142) tr. the part. "being enhanced," Ge "gesteigert." The lexeme *ádhi √nī* is found only once elsewhere in the RV (VIII.30.3) and, acdg. to MonWms, nowhere else in Skt. In VIII.30.3 it means 'lead /from out of' (though it is likely that *ádhi* there, flg. an abl. and not in a normal preverb position, is actually simply a postposition). I think the same sense may be found here: the *manyú-* is being drawn out of Indra, enabling him to perform the violent deeds in d and the following vs. (8).

Note that the two verbs in d are reprised in the next two vss.: *rurója* (7b), *śṛṇāsi* (8b).

X.89.7: The first three pādas begin with fronted perfects *jaghā́na*, *rurója*, *bibhéda*.

The second clause in b, *áradan ná síndhūn*, is, at the least, highly abbreviated. It is likely that *ná sindhū́n* is a simile, with *ná* barred from final position by rule (see my 2024 ECIEC paper "Penultimate *ná* 'like' in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism," to appear in a forthcoming Fs.). However, there is no corresponding acc. in the frame. Moreover, judging from the use of *√rad* elsewhere, we might expect a dative *síndhubhyaḥ* rather than an acc., with the object 'way', 'path', vel sim. See, e.g., VII.47.4 *yā́bhya índro áradad gātúm ū́rmim* / ... *sindhavaḥ* ... "(You) for whom Indra dug out a way, a wave ... o rivers." This assumption underlies the publ. tr. However, VII.49.1 allows an acc. of "waters" in the same slot: *índro yā́ḥ ... rarā́da, tā́ ā́paḥ* ... "which ones Indra dug out, those waters ..." On the basis of this latter passage, I would modify our tr. to "He dug (them [= fortresses]) out like rivers."

X.89.8ff.: As disc. in the publ. intro. and see also Ge n. 8, the focus of the hymn shifts to the punishment of those who break alliances (*mitrá-*) or have no alliances at all – a theme with deep Indo-Iranian roots, as Ge also points out.

X.89.8: On the strongly emphatic use of *ha tyád* with 2nd sg. prn. see I.63.4–7, VI.18.3, VIII.96.16–18 and comm. ad locc.

In d I take the object *yújam ... mitrám* as inanimate: "a bound alliance" (see also JPB, *Ādityas* 30: "a union (or) an alliance"), while for Ge it's animate: "einen verbündeten Freund" (which in my terms would be "yokemate (and) ally"). In favor of the JPB/SJ interpr., *prá √mī* almost always takes an inanimate obj. (though this argument may be undercut by the following vs. [however see below]), and, as the obj. in this simile, the phrase is parallel to inanimate *dhā́ma* 'ordinances' in the frame. In favor of Ge's rendering, the root noun *yúj-* is otherwise overwhelmingly animate. I would consider an alt. tr. "yokemate (and) ally" here, but see comm. on 9 immed. below.

X.89.9: As was just noted, *prá √mī* almost always takes an inanimate obj. Here the verb has four distinct objects, each marked out by the repetition of the preverb *prá* immediately before. One of these, *saṃgíraḥ* 'agreements', is definitely inanim. (and in its other occurrence is also the obj. of *prá √mī* [IX.86.16]), while *mitrá-* can, of course, be either the divine name or the common noun 'alliance'. Thieme (M+A 62–63) takes all four objects as inanimate nouns: "... who deceive/betray ... a contract (*mitrá*), a [*sic*] *hospitality* (*aryamán*), [friendly] agreements

(*saṃgír*), true speech (*váruṇa*)." JPB (*Ādityas* 86–87) follows Th in taking all four nominals in an appellative sense, though with different renderings of *aryamáṇam* ("custom") and, esp., *váruṇam* ("commandment"). His argument for the appellative sense in part rests on an observation similar to that made above, that "the object of *prá mī* is never a god or a man, but rather a principle" (87). Although I'm not sure I want to go so far as to eliminate the gods from this passage entirely, esp. given the undoubted presence of Mitra and Varuṇa in the preceding vs. (8c), I now see that the presence of clear inanimate *saṃgíraḥ* and ambiguous *mitrám* invites or requires at least a secondary inanimate reading for *aryámaṇam* and *váruṇam* too and I would now tr. the VP "... who transgress against Mitra [/alliance] and against Aryaman [/custom], against agreements and against Varuṇa [/commandment]." In other words, to transgress against the god is to transgress against the principle he embodies – or, perhaps better, vice versa.

The rel. cl. in ab is either dependent on *amítreṣu* in the main clause (c) ("on those without alliance who ...") or covertly conjoined with it ("on those without alliance (and those) who ...").

Note the acc. *vṛ́ṣāṇam*, with vṛddhi in the suffix, against the overwhelming number of forms to this stem with guṇa in the suffixal strong forms (acc. *vṛ́ṣaṇam*, etc.). There is only one other such form (in IX.34.3; see comm. ad loc.). It is not surprising that such *n*-stems would be attracted into the dominant vṛddhied type; what is a bit surprising in this passage is that it's in the same vs. with *aryamáṇam* which maintains guṇa in its suffix.

X.89.10: Acdg. to Schindler (Root noun s.v. p. 45), the root noun *vṛ́dh-* is only a Nom. act. "Vermehrung" (etc.): "An keiner Stelle ist vr̥dh- Adj. oder Nag." Although this statement is accurate for the numerous singular occurrences of the stem, it cannot apply to this gen. pl., parallel to the gen. pl. *médhirāṇām* "of the wise (ones)"; it must mean "strong (ones)." Perhaps the presence of them. adj. *vṛdhá-* in the next vs. influenced the usage, though this is not much of a hypothesis.

Pāda d has both a rare break (– –) and a bad cadence (⏑ ⏑ – ×) (see, e.g., HvN metr. comm.). Arnold (322) suggests flipping *yóge háv^{i}ya* – × to *háv^{i}yo yóge* – ×, which would fix both problems – and would also distribute the paired terms *kṣéme yóge* in a way more in keeping with the other three pādas, where the pairs are broken up. Although Arnold's suggestion neatly solves two problems, my hesitation is that it is difficult to see why the word order would have been disturbed redactionally to produce a metrically bad outcome. Old also is not convinced.

X.89.11: This vs. contains 8 occurrences of the preverb *prá*, each with an associated ablative. The verb with which they are construed and which provides the idiom that controls the abl. ("project beyond") is *ririce*, which is found only in the break of the last pāda. Note also that *prá* is teasingly doubled by the *s*-stem abl. *práthasaḥ* in c.

X.89.12: The preverb *prá*, so prominent in 11, has one last gasp at the beginning of 12, but in a different verbal lexeme (*prá* √*vṛt*), a small ex. of the poet's sly misdirections.

The simile in c, *áśmeva ... divá ā́ sṛjānáḥ* "like a stone being launched from heaven," seems at first to connect with the last word of b, *hetíḥ* ("... missile like a stone"), but the 2nd sg. impv. *vidhya* in c redirects the comparison: it's Indra, the implicit subject of the impv., who's being compared to the stone, not his missile – yet another ex. of the subtle shifts and red herrings that this poet cleverly indulges in.

The cmpd *drógha-mitra-* is generally taken as a tatp., e.g., "ein arglistiger, falscher Freund" (Gr), with unexpected accent (AiG II.1.266), or, with Ge (n. 12d), as a cmpd with a

governing 1st member ("die Freundbetrüger"). Old sensibly wants it to be a bahuvr. and suggests the somewhat less sensible gloss "den Trug zum Freund habend." Given the abstract use of *mitrá-* elsewhere in this hymn, I suggest rather the b.v. 'whose alliances are deceitful'.

X.89.13: Like vs. 11, in which the repeated *prá*-s culminate in the last pāda with the withheld verb *ririce*, here repeated *ánu*-s (6, this time) find their verb in *ajihata* in d. The obj. of this verb is also withheld till the 2nd hemistich: *índram* in c.

Gr, Lub, and the publ. tr. take *áha* as the particle *áha* (of unclear function), but Ge (see n. 13a) as the neut. pl. of 'days'. An argument against Ge's interpr. would be that in the rest of the vs. each *ánu* is associated with only a single element, whereas here there would be two: "days (and) months" – and a similar one-to-one relationship is found in vss. 8cd–9ab and 11 with repeated *prá*. However, in this vs. the various nominals associated with the preverb are ill-assorted: "months" is the only temporal designation, with the others being features of geography/landscape: trees (a), plants (b), mountains (b), world-halves (c), waters (d). If the first *ánu* syntagm contains both days and months, the conceptual imbalance would be considerably lessened. I therefore would now substitute the tr. "The days (and) months gave way ..." For another short-vowel pl. *áha* see I.92.3.

X.89.14: The root affiliation of the hapax *cetyā́-* is disputed: to √*ci*[3] 'avenge, requite' or to √*cit* 'perceive' (Gr); see Old and EWA s.v. The tone of the hymn certainly favors the former, and this is reflected in most tr. (Ge, Scar 88, publ. tr.).

Ge construes *aghásya* with *cetyā́*, but the pāda boundary is (weakly) against that, and it works perfectly well with *rákṣaḥ*.

Although Gr assigns *éṣat* to a separate root √*eṣ* 'gleiten, schleichen', it is better analyzed as *ī́ṣat* + *ā́* to the them. pres. *ī́ṣa-* (so Old, Ge, Gotō [1st Cl, 109 n. 84]).

The cmpd *mitra-krū́-* (Gr *-krú-*) and esp. its 2nd member are much discussed; see esp. Scar 88–89, EWA I.414–15. The word is obviously related to *krūrá-* 'bloody' (AV+), *kravís-* 'bloody flesh'; the question is whether *krū* is a verbal root or pseudo-verbal root or is simply a nominal 'blood' (vel sim.). In my view, whether or not there was a "real" root √*krū* 'be/make bloody', in this hapax cmpd the second member is treated as such. Only this interpr. accounts for the accent and the likely meaning.

As disc. in the publ. intro., I consider pāda d an intertextual reference to two famous phrases in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, both describing the slain Vṛtra: I.32.5 ... *śayata upapṛ́k pṛthivyā́ḥ* "... will lie as the embracer of the earth" (like our *pṛthivyā́ āpṛ́k ... śayante*) and I.32.8 ... *amuyā́ śáyānam* "... lying in that way" (like our *amuyā́ śayante*). (Both passages are also adduced by Ge, n. 14d.) Because of the strong similarities between I.32 and our passage I think it likely that our *ā́pṛk* is a simple substitution under different metrical conditions for *upapṛ́k* in I.32.5 and it is therefore unnec. to seek a special sense of the root noun cmpd here – as in Ge's "... nur so platt auf die Erde liegen werden" [I'm not sure how he gets that] or Scar's "als ein die Erde anfüllender Haufen derart daliegen."

X.89.15: The hapax *ogaṇá-* is taken by Gr (etc.) as derived from **avagaṇa-* lit. 'von seiner Schar verstossen'. Both the deriv. and the proposed sense are vigorously disputed by Old, with ample ref. to previous lit. Old suggests a connection with SV *úgaṇa-* and the sense 'strong', which is reflected in current tr. (Ge, Kü 205, publ. tr.). The likely deriv. was sketched by KH (Aufs. 397–98 [MSS 8 (1956)]; see also EWA s.v.), from a putative **ogr̥-ná-* with MIA dev. of syllabic **r̥*;

cf. Aves. *r*-stem *aogarə* 'power'. This is very likely and is reflected in the publ. tr., but it should be pointed out that these enemies should not *be* powerful, but think themselves so – the word must somehow fall under the domain of *vrā́dhanta(ḥ)*. See KH's tr. (397) "die sich als Machtvolle sehr hochgemut fühlenden." Lub has recently disputed the MIA origins of this word ("Chronology of the PS" in *Studies in the Atharvaveda* [ed. Leach et al.], 2025: 76–77).

Pādas c and d present contrastive images: the unallianced associated with "blind darkness" in contrast to "the nights with their good lights" (*sujyotíṣo aktávaḥ*) that overcome the enemies. But why are the nights the agents here? Old suggests that the nights stand for our allies, who prevail over the darkness of the foe. Possibly, but a more standard RVic image would be for the day (/dawn/sun) to prevail over the darkness of night – not to compare the victorious side with the only comparatively brighter night. In fact Ge (n. 15d) asserts that the sense is "Das Licht soll über die Finsternis triumphieren," so the emphasis in d is on the *lights* of the nights. This still doesn't seem to me entirely satisfactory.

X.89.16–18: Starting with vs. 16 the hymn winds down with standard hymn-ending clichés: urging Indra to come to *our* sacrifice (16) and expressing the hope that we may reap the benefits of his presence (17). The here-and-now of the ritual is expressed by *imā́m ... sáhūtim* "this common call here" (16c) and *nūnám* "now," the final word of 17. The *evā́* opening 17 is a common way to introduce the final summary vs. of a hymn. And as often in final verses, the poet explicitly identifies himself and his lineage by "(we) Viśvāmitras" in 17d. In fact 17 is the real final vs.: vs. 18 is borrowed from III.30.22, the final vs. of an Indra hymn in the Viśvāmitra maṇḍala -- another way of stamping the Viśvāmitra signature on this Xth Maṇḍala hymn attributed to a Viśvāmitra descendent, Reṇu Vaiśvāmitra.

X.89.17: The poet's presentation of the Viśvāmitra signature just discussed is somewhat complicated by this vs. As just noted, he borrows a final vs. (18) from the Viśvāmitra maṇḍala (though it does not mention the Viśvāmitras directly), and he associates himself explicitly with the Viśvāmitras in 17d. But 17cd is a direct borrowing of (or, to be more circumspect, is identical with) VI.25.9, another hymn-final vs., *except* that for *viśvāmitrā(ḥ)* in d, VI.25.9 has *bharádvājā(ḥ)*. In other words, our crafty poet's most direct claim for his Viśvāmitra identity is made by boldly manipulating (/stealing) the signature vs. of a different poetic lineage – another sign of the intertextuality disc. ad vs. 14.

On the syntactic issues in cd, see comm. ad VI.25.9. As I suggest there, the problematic *utá* may be connecting the two temporal expressions *vástoḥ* and *nūnám*, and the tr. could be altered to "as we sing at dawn and also now."

X.90 Puruṣa [SJ on JPB]

For a hymn as familiar and much treated as this one, a full commentary on content would be de trop. I will limit myself to comments on details that may have become elided as the "meaning" of the hymn became a consensus product of commentators both ancient/medieval and indigenous, and modern and Western. For which, consult the numerous available translations and discussions of it.

X.90.1: On the "ten-fingers' breadth" see publ. intro., as well as Ge's extensive n. 1d.

X.90.2: There is some ambiguity in the construction of the 2nd hemistich, viz., how to connect pāda d with c. The current standard interpr. is the one found in the publ. tr., with *yád* a subordinating conjunction and the subject of *atiróhati* the Puruṣa: "when he climbs beyond (this world) ..." (more or less already Sāy., see also Re Hymnes spéc., Don, and Old's comm., attributing this to Weber). However, *yád* could also be a neut. prn. with antecedent *ámṛtatvasya* in c or a gapped gen. **tasya* in c parallel to *ámṛtatvasya*. The latter is Ge's interpr.: "er ist die Herr über die Unsterblichkeit (und auch über das), was durch Speise noch weiter wachst." By this interpr. *yád* is the subj. of *atiróhati*, but it would also be possible to combine this pronominal interpr. with one where the Puruṣa is the subj.: "he is master over immortality (and over that which) he grows beyond ..." or "he is master over immortality, which he grows beyond ..." For some disc. see Ge's n. 2d.

The problem is compounded by the fact that the lexeme *áti* √*ruh* seems to be confined to this single passage (and its later repetitions). In the supposed example in RV IX.17.5 given by Gr (and repeated by MonWms) the *áti* is construed elsewise, and the passages cited in VB for mantra language actually contain *ádhi* (save for reps. of this passage). Nonetheless, *áti* does give us some interpretational help. As Old points out, *áti* is found with verbs that have the Puruṣa as subj. in the preceding vs. (1d) and in 5c, and so a certain excess, a "beyondness," may characterize the Puruṣa (see also in the next vs. 4b *áto jyā́yān* "(he is) more than that"). This would favor taking him as subj. of *atiróhati* here, whatever we do with the *yád* and whatever we make of the rest of the expression.

My point here is not to choose among these possibilities, but point out that there are a number of syntactic ambiguities that keep a single interpr. from being imposed on this hemistich.

X.90.3–4: These two vss. contain the pairs #*pā́daḥ* ..., #*tripā́d* ... (3cd) / #*tripā́d* ..., #*pā́daḥ* ... (4ab), arranged chiastically, each member of each pair opening a pāda. This tight structure, combined with the exact repetition, invites (or requires) a strictly parallel interpretation of the words. Yet all the standard tr., incl. the publ. tr., render *tripā́d* differently in the two vss.: in 3 as a noun ("three quarters"), but in 4 as a bahuvrīhi ("having three quarters"). Compounds formed thus are bahuvrīhis; see esp. the very common *dvipád-* 'two-footed'. The rendering of *tripā́d* in 3b must therefore be adjusted; see below.

X.90.3: I would alter the tr. of ab to "a quarter (/[one] foot) of him is all existing things; the immortal in heaven has his (other) three quarters (/feet)." For the reasons for this reinterpr. esp. of *tripā́d* see comm. immed. above; for *bhūtá-* as "existing things" see the use of *bhūtám* in the preceding vs. (2b) as "what has come into being."

X.90.4: Note that the publ. tr. "with his three quarters ..." is simply a rendering of the nom. sg. of the bahuvr. *tripā́d*, which more literally (though less clearly) would be "Having his three quarters, the Man ..."

X.90.6: There is a generally unnoticed contradiction in this famous vs., which is sometimes obscured by translational choices. In pāda a the Man is identified as the *havís-*, but in d the *havís-* is "autumn" (*śarád*). The publ. tr. properly tr. them both as "offering"; likewise Ge "Opfergabe." But Re (HSpéc) "substance oblatoire ... offrande"; Don "offering ... oblation." I don't know what to make of this duplication, which seems more careless than pointed – I don't think that the Man is being identified as autumn (or vice versa) -- but it should be noted.

X.90.7: I think the literal sense of *praúkṣan* should be rendered: "they sprinkled [=consecrated]."

The Sādhyas, a group of divinities, are mentioned in the RV only in this hymn (see also vs. 16) and in a vs. identical to our vs. 16 in the likewise late "riddle" hymn, I.164.50. They are somewhat more prominent, though hardly better defined, in Vedic prose texts.

That the Sādhyas and the seers were sacrificers, not the sacrificed, might be clearer in the publ. tr. if "(also)" were changed to "(as did)."

X.90.7–8: Both of these vss. make use of the "X and which Y" construction: 7d *sādhyā́ ṛ́ṣayaś ca yé* and 8d *āraṇyā́n grāmyā́ś ca yé*, with the latter based on an acc. phrase *āraṇyān *grāmyā́ṃś ca*. Another ex. of the construction is found in 10ab.

X.90.8: Unfortunately I do not think that the publ. tr.'s rendering of the 2nd hemistich can be correct. It takes *cakre* as passive "was made into," with "sacrifice" as the supplied subject to which a series of nouns denoting animals are secondarily predicated. But that series is all in the acc., and surely a construction "X was made into Y" would require nominatives in the predication (see in fact *rājanyàḥ kṛtáḥ* in 12b). Moreover, medial forms of the pf. of √*kṛ* seem to be self-involved transitives ("made for oneself") rather than passive (see Kü 136). So, although the passive interpr. seems to me preferable on thematic grounds and would be parallel to the intrans./passives *jajñire* (3x), *ajāya(n)ta* (2x), *jātā́ḥ* in vss. 9–10, I'm afraid we have to follow the other standard interpr. (though see a tortured disc. of the problem in Re EVP XVI.149–50) in supplying an unidentified agent (the Ur-Creator or Ur-Sacrificer) as subject – hence "he [=Ur-Sacrificer?] made (it [=butter]) into the animals ..."

Since the "... and which Y" part of the "X and which Y" construction (on which see comm. ad vss. 7–8) only affects the final term, while *āraṇyā́n* is in the acc., parallel to *vāyavyā̀n*, a more syntactically accurate rendering would be "... those of the air, those of the wilderness, and those that belong to the village." This produces a more satisfactory Behaghel effect.

X.90.8–9: The root noun cmpd *sarvahút-* is difficult to interpr. It goes all too easily into "was offered in full" (publ. tr.), "vollständig geopferten" (Ge), etc., which makes it sound like a past part. cmpd. (**sárvahuta-*), but both its root accent and the cons. stem abl. ending make that impossible. Although root noun cmpds can sometimes have passive value, that is fairly rare. I would favor an interpr. of the type "offering everything" – a kind of go-for-broke complete sacrifice. That all animate beings were the result in 8cd might then not be surprising.

X.90.10: I would suggest a small correction from "teeth on both jaws" to "in both jaws."

Although most mammals have teeth in both jaws (incl. obviously humans), in the context of this vs., which names domestic herd animals, esp. those associated with the sacrifice, the semantic field is considerably narrowed. Cows, goats, and sheep (all in the 2nd hemistich) have teeth only in their lower jaws, whereas horses (pāda a) have them in both. It's not clear to me what other diphyodont animals are referred to in pāda b (donkeys? mules?).

The first hemistich contains another example of the "X and which Y" construction (see comm. ad vss. 7–8 above), with the further complication that the Y is an indefinite (*yé ké ca*).

X.90.12: This is probably the most famous vs. in this famous hymn, depicting the creation of the four varṇas, which are otherwise not found in the RV. Although the correspondences between body part and varṇa are straightforward, the syntax gets somewhat tangled.

There is no problem with pāda a, but in pāda b the number mismatch between du. *bāhū́* 'two arms' and sg. *rajanyàḥ* is compounded by the agreement of the past part. *kṛtáḥ* with the latter, not the former – leading to the publ. tr.'s "The ruler was made his two arms." This is of course temporally and causally incorrect – it should mean (and should be corrected to) "(his) two arms were made into the Rājanya" – and we must assume a local adjustment whereby the ppl. agrees with the immediately adjacent predicate.

Pāda c is more complex. By my interpr. it contains the first, and only RVic, example of a construction that becomes ubiquitous in Vedic prose, which I have termed "proto-izafe" (see Fs. Mark Hale 2022, where I discuss this passage p. 175): an equational sentence in which the equated element is found in a postposed nominal rel. cl. whose rel. is always the neut. sg. *yád* whatever the gender/number of the referent. The main clause is also generally nominal and contains a demonst. prn. (usually *eṣá-* / *etá-*), as in MS I.4.6 (114) *eté vaí devā́ áhutādo yád brāhmaṇā́ḥ* "Truly these are the non-oblation-eating gods, namely the Brahmins." Our passage is constructed in a very similar way, except that the pronominal form in the main cl. is also neut., rather than agreeing with the nominal subject there as in the Vedic prose exx. I therefore would tr. "this (was) his thighs, namely the Vaiśyas." In other words, contrary to the publ. tr., which seems to take *ūrū́* as a vague accusative of reference ("as to his thighs"), I interpr. it as a nominative and subject of an equational construction.

The final pāda is syntactically impeccable.

X.90.14: Note that the two feet are the source of the earth here, but of the Śūdras in 12d.

X.90.16: The first pāda with its three forms of √*yaj* – *yajñéna yajñám ayajanta devā́ḥ* -- is famous and disputed. Many interpr. it as the publ. tr. does, with *yajñám* as a cognate acc. with *ayajanta* forming a phrasal verb that just means "performed sacrifice." By contrast, I interpr. *yajñám* in the same way as other accusative objects with √*yaj* (usually gods), as the recipient of the sacrifice: "the gods sacrificed to the sacrifice with the sacrifice." See X.124.6, with a similar expression discussed in my 2016 Staal Ged. contribution "The Divine Revolution of *Ṛgveda* X.124" (p. 297), where I argue that this formulation expresses an "endless loop, an inescapable reflexivity," which is only broken when the human–divine sacrificial compact is established. I would change the tr. of this pāda to match my suggestion. See also X.130.3.

I do not understand pāda c, in particular what *té ... mahimā́naḥ* "these greatnesses" refers to. The publ. tr.'s awkward attempt to achieve parsable English with "its greatness" while honoring the pl. with "these" ("these, its greatness, ...") does not satisfy either. I'd substitute "these great powers" without any idea of what is being expressed.

X.91 Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn resembles X.89, as a well-crafted consciously traditional poetic product, even though the poet to whom it is ascribed is not the same as that of X.89 and the starkly innovative X.90 intervenes between them. The composition is nicely balanced with pleasingly intricate patterns of repetition and variation.

X.91.1: This vs. is crammed with both etymological figures and figures of sense (that is, synonyms or near-synonyms that are not etymologically related). The former include *dáme dámūnā(ḥ)* (b), *suṣákhā sakhīyaté* (d), and possibly *hótā havíṣaḥ* (c) [it's hard to know whether a Rigvedic audience would perceive an etymological relation between the two]. Figures of sense – in many ways more interesting – are *jāgṛvádbhir járamāṇa(ḥ)* (a) and *iṣáyann iḷáḥ* (b) (on the assumption that to the Vedic Sprachgefühl the root nouns *íḍ-* and *íṣ-* [with its verbal form *iṣáya-*] were etymologically unconnected). A third type is exemplified by *vibhúr vibhāvā* (d), in which the near phonological identity overcomes lack of etymological or semantic identity.

X.91.2: The dominant stylistic feature in this vs. is the āmreḍita, with one per pāda: *gṛhé-gṛhe* (a), *váne-vane* (b), *jánaṃ-janam* (c), *víśaṃ-viśam* (d), which are tightly patterned. Those in the first hemistich are both in the loc. and are adjacent to each other, at the end of a and the beginning of b. Those in the 2nd hemistich are in the acc. and maximally distant, at the beginning of c and end of d.

The āmreḍita is not the only stylistic feature. The first hemistich contains two nom. sg. rt-noun cmpds in *-ṭ̂r* (in sandhi), *darśataśrṭ̂r ... takvavṭ̂r*, with nom. sg. *átithir* also participating in this phonetic figure. The 2nd member *-śrīr* (a) is echoed by *śiśriye* (b), though they are etymologically and semantically unrelated (so also Ge n. 2ab). The second hemistich goes in for etymological figures connected to the āmreḍitas: c *jánaṃ-janaṃ ján^{i}yaḥ* and d *víśaḥ ... viś^{i}yo víśaṃ-viśam*. And we might note that *ján^{i}ya-* and *viś^{i}ya-* are similarly formed and similarly related to the root syllable of their respective āmreḍitas.

On *darśata-śrṭ̂-* see Scar 552 and for the general challenges of interpr. *-śrṭ̂-* cmpds 546.

On *takva-vṭ̂-* see comm. ad I.151.5, 134.5, also Scar 497–98. Note that *váne-vane* is read differently in simile and frame.

X.91.2–3: Almost like a textbook demonstration, these two vss. showcase the contrasting presents to the roots √*kṣi* 'dwell' and √*kṣā*, *kṣi* 'rule, own', both in the active indic. sg. for convenient comparison: 2d *kṣeti*, 3c *kṣayasi*.

X.91.3: The first three pādas are defined by etymological figures of a straightforward sort: *sudákṣo dákṣaiḥ* (a), *krátunā ... sukrátuḥ* (a), *kavíḥ kāvyena* (c), *vásur vásūnām* (c). Again there is internal patterning. All three pairs in the first hemistich have a nom. / instr. pairing; the nominatives in pāda a are compds with *su-* and the pairs in a are chiastically arranged. In c the 2nd term is gen., not instr. All three pairs in ab have parallels elsewhere (see Ge's nn.), though not all together or so densely arranged.

In c (*ék)a íd* # provides a rhyme for b (*víśv)avít* #, which make help to account for the unusual, though by no means unprecedented, position of *íd*.

X.91.4: *íḷāyās padé* picks up *iḷás padé* in 1b. Note the close sandhi in both phrases.

On the sandhi of *ivétayaḥ* (prob. *iva étayaḥ*) see Old with further lit.

X.91.5: In pāda a *śríyaḥ* picks up (*darśata-*)*śrṭ̂ḥ* of 2a.

The phrase *cikitra uṣásām* recurs in 5b from 4c; in both cases of course *uṣásām* is not directly construed with the verb. In 5b the verb also enters into an etymological and phonological figure: *citrā́ś cikitra* (in sandhi).

X.91.6: After Agni's attack on the plants in 5c and his consumption of them as his food in 5d, this vs. depicts the temporally / logically prior actions whereby the plants, with the help of the waters (here probably the rains that foster plant growth or the water [=sap/juice] internal to the plants), conceive Agni/fire and give birth to him.

Pāda-final *ṛtvíyam* is repeated from 4a; see also 10a below.

The second hemistich contains three instances of *ca*. The one in c is an inverse *ca* connecting the nominals *vanínaḥ* and *vīrúdhaḥ*. The second pair, in d, conjoin the two predicates *antárvatīḥ* and *súvate*. As JSK (DGRV I.172) points out, we should supply a finite form of √*bhū* vel sim. with the adjective *antárvatīḥ* (though correct his sg. [*bhavati*] to [*bhavanti*]). *súvate* is presumably accented because it is a contrastive predicate (see Old as well as Re's n. on the passage).

Ge (n. 6d) adduces as parallel III.55.5c, which in fact adds a new wrinkle in the form of a paradox. It too concerns the birth of fire from plants: *antárvatīḥ suvate ápravītāḥ* "Having (him) within, (though) unimpregnated they give birth to (him)." In that passage *antárvatīḥ* contrasts with *ápravītāḥ* -- the presumable difference is that though the plants have embryonic fire within and are in that sense pregnant, they are not so because of sexual activity.

I consider *samānám* (c) and *viśváhā* (d) as conceptually contrastive, despite their distance from each other. Hence my tr. "who is just the same everywhere." This is not the standard interpr.: JSK (172) takes *samānám* as an acc. sg. m. emphasizing the identity of the preceding *tám* with the two *tám*-s opening pādas a and b; Ge and Re take it as an adv. (gleichmässig / en commun) loosely applied to the woody plants and sprouts. I think my interpr. yields richer semantics and reflects the standard trope that there are many fires, which are also the same fire. However, the repetition of *samānám íd* in 8c may lend some support to JSK's interpr.

X.91.7: This vs. returns to the theme of 5cd, with the mature Agni consuming the plants (that gave birth to him in 6).

The position of *yád* is at least a minor violation of the usual rules; see also vs. 12 below.

X.91.8: In Engl. the vs. seems to veer abruptly from the 3rd ps. to the 2nd at the very end (see also Old, who remarks on the switch), but the Skt. of the first 3½ pādas does not *have* to be read as 3rd ps. It consists of a string of acc. singulars, so there is no obligatory ps. marking, and could simply take up the 2nd ps. ref. to Agni in vs. 7. However, the repeated *tám*-s in cd, as well as the acc. *agním* in b, would incline the audience to a 3rd ps. reading. See also comm. on the next vs., 9.

I do not understand the case mismatch between the contrastive pair *árbhe* (loc., c) and *mahé* (dat., d). Perhaps the surface identity of the case endings in *-e* outweighed their grammatical disharmony.

X.91.9: The first hemistich of this vs. closely tracks vs. 8, with the differences between them seeming to force a 3rd ps. interpr. on most of vs. 8 (see disc. just above) contrasting with the overt 2nd ps. of 9ab: instead of *tám íd ... vṛṇate* (8cd) we have *tvā́m íd ... vṛṇate tvāyávaḥ* (9a); instead of *agníṃ hótāram* (8b) *hótāram agne* (9b) – both with explicit 2nd ps. readings.

X.91.10: This vs. is identical to II.1.2. In his usual quest to identify the original locus of repeated vss. (a quest we would not undertake in this post-Parry-Lord era), Bloomfield (RR, ad 2.12) suggests that ours is the original: "The stanza is rather abrupt in 2.1, whereas in 10.91 its

sequence is peculiarly fit." Presumably he is referring to the three mentions of Agni as Hotar in the two preceding vss. (8b, 9b) and the following vs. (11c) and the occurrence of the rare denom. *adhvarīyási* in 11d – but one could argue in reverse that these occurrences invited the insertion of a stock vs. containing *hotrám* and *adhvarīyasi* on the principle of concatenation. Note also that pāda-final *ṛtvíyam* (a) matches those in 4a and 6a.

X.91.11: Re suggest that this vs. is a gloss of 10; as I just indicated, I would argue in the opposite direction, that 10 is a ready-made vs. that was inserted between 9 and 11 on the basis of lexical and conceptual similarities.

X.91.12–13: The vs.-initial *imā́ḥ*, *imā́m* usher in the last section of the hymn, in which the poet announces the here-and-now of the current ritual and esp. the praise the poet himself is offering to Agni. To emphasize the parallelism of the two vss., the tr. of 13 should begin "this good praise here would I proclaim ..."

X.91.12: The first hemistich piles up an impressive array of ritual speech types.

The second hemistich returns to the etymological figures that were prominent in the early vss.: *vasūyávo vásave* (c), recalling *vásur vásūnām* in 3c, and *vṛddhā́su ... várdhanaḥ* (d). The position of *yā́su* in d is a more egregious violation of the usual placement of relatives than the one noted in 7. It may have been displaced to the right in order to accommodate the etym. figure that opens the pāda.

Re claims that *várdhana-* must be intrans. here, contrary to its other occurrences (and, I'd add, to the standard trans./caus. function of *-ana*-nominals), but there is no necessity for this view. *várdhana-* responds implicitly to *vasūyávaḥ*: Agni strengthens the already strong ritual praises he receives by awarding them goods.

X.91.13: The juxtaposition of the newer praise and its age-old target is a fine ex. of the deployment of resonant tropes of Indo-Iranian praise-poetry.

X.91.14: The extravagant list of domestic animals in ab is structurally parallel to the list of ritual speech types in 12ab. However, I don't understand what actually happens to these beasts. With Ge and Re, the publ. tr. takes *ā́hutāḥ* to be the equivalent of 'offered' (/ 'sacrificed'), but these are not standard Vedic sacrificial animals – even the horse, whose sacrifice is rare and special. Although it might be possible to interpret the animals as standing for the sacrificial substances they produce – like "cows" for "milk" – none of them is associated in that way with an offering substance. Moreover the juxtaposed ppl. *avasṛṣṭā́sa ā́hutāḥ* seem self-contradictory, since *áva* √*sṛj* means 'release'; cf. the internal contradictions of Ge's "... freigelassen geopfert werden" and Re's "... sont offerts après avoir été mis en liberté" (though see Scar's tr. [311], which harmonizes them: "... [zum Opfer] losgelassen, geopfert werden"). I now think that *ā́huta-* must be used as it is when Agni is the referent – that it means, literally and actually, 'bepoured, besprinkled' (see the same usage of *práhuta-* in the next hymn, X.92.3). If *avasṛṣṭá-* 'released' refers to a situation like that in the Aśvamedha in later śrauta ritual where multiple *wild* animals are tied to yūpas as if to be sacrificed but then released, perhaps our passage alludes to a similar situation but with domestic animals. Perhaps at their release they were sprinkled with a token portion of ghee that sacralized them. I would feel more comfortable about this hypothesis if there were any other evidence for it that I am aware of. It also makes some trouble with *yásmin*:

yásmin ... ā́hutāḥ can most easily be interpr. as "into which/whom (they are) offered." But perhaps it refers to the animals' proximity to the ritual fire: "at which ..." In any case, I would now change the tr. to "at whom/which horses, bulls, oxen, mated cows, rams are released (and) anointed (with ghee)," though without a lot of confidence in its correctness.

It is possible that this parade of domestic animals is related to the hapax epithet of Agni in c, *kīlāla-pā́-* 'k.-drinking' (on which see Scar's minimal disc., 311). Although *kīlāla-* is found only here in the RV, it is common in AV (both Ś and P) +. As its phonology also suggests, this drink seems to belong to a lower-register domestic sphere and is sometimes associated with farm animals. See, e.g., AVŚ VII.60.5 (≅ AVP III.26.5) *úpahūtā ihá gā́va úpahūtā ajāváyaḥ / átho ánnasya kīlā́la úpahūto gṛhéṣu naḥ* "Called on here are the cows, called on the goats and sheep; then called on is the *kīlāla* of food in our houses." In Ś IV.11.10 (/P III.25.12) the draft-ox (*anaḍváh-*) and plowmen "go to" *kīlāla-*, while in P VIII.11.3 two draught-oxen are involved. Although I can't (yet) construct a scenario that provides a function for the list of animals in ab, I now think this unusual ritual assemblage must be connected to the unusual *kīlāla*-drink – though I don't know why this association is found in the penultimate vs. of an otherwise traditional Agni hymn.

X.91.15: *āsyè* returns from 5d.

X.92 All Gods

On the (lack of) organization of this hymn, see publ. intro. Ge suggests that it is not correctly transmitted.

X.92.1: With Ge and Re, I supply a 1st ps. verb of speech to govern the acc. phrase of ab. This phrase has a stately traditional feel. Though Agni is not named, the descriptors unambiguously identify him: *yajñásya .. rathyàm* closely resembles *rathī́r adhvarā́ṇām* "charioteer of the ceremonies" used of Agni in I.44.2=VIII.11.2 and VI.7.2; *viśpáti- viśā́m* is a standard epithet of Agni (e.g., III.2.10, V.4.3). Hotar is of course his regular role (and is heavily present in the preceding hymn; see comm. ad X.91.10); *átithi-* 'guest' is also standard for Agni and appears in the preceding hymn (X.91.2). *vibhā́-vasu-* is only used of Agni, and cf. *vibhā́vā* in X.91.1.

The description of Agni switches to the nom. in the 2nd hemistich, capped by the finite injunc. *aśāyata* of which Agni is the subj. On this stem see comm. ad VI.33.2. IH suggests that this injunc. should have presential value, and an alt. "reaches heaven" is certainly possible; so KH (Injunk. 119).

The two word pairs in c, *śócañ chúṣkāsu* and *háriṇīṣu járbhurad*, are syntactically parallel though chiastic: nom. sg. m. pres. part. / loc. pl. f. // loc. pl. f. / nom. sg. m. pres. part. They also have a pseudo-etymological feel enabled by phonology: *śóc* and *śúṣk* / *hár* and *járbhur*.

X.92.2: Both Ge and Re construe *akṛṇvata* with two acc.: "make Agni (into) X." Although this is certainly possible, I prefer to take this mid. verb in the meaning 'make (their) own', a meaning found elsewhere, with the other acc.s further descriptors.

The 2nd member of the rt noun cmpd. *añjas-pā́-* is variously interpr. Old and Re take it to √*pā* 'protect', Scar (317) to a third (and in my opinion unnec.) root √*pā* 'gehen, sich bewegen'. With Gr and Ge, I assign it to √*pā* 'drink'. The point, as Ge notes (n. 2a), is that Agni consumes the oblation without intermediary, unlike the (other) gods, who have Agni as their mediating

mouth. In its other occurrence, in nearby X.94.13, the cmpd modifies the pressing stones, who get the (literally) first crack at the soma.

Agni's role as supporter (*dharmán-*) reminds us of nearby X.88.1, where, at least in my interpr., Agni is charged to "support the world" (*bhúvanāya ... dhármaṇe*). In the publ. tr. I implicitly construe *dharmā́ṇam* with *vidáthasya* (also dependent on *sā́dhanam*), but in light of X.88.1 an alt. might be "supporter (of the world), furtherer of the rite." This alternative might be favored by the appearance of the parallel phrase *vidáthasya prasā́dhanam* in the preceding hymn (X.91.8), suggesting that it is a (semi-)fixed phrase with the gen. locked in. And indeed most occurrences of *sā́dhana-* have a gen. sg. of the sacrifice / rite, etc.

For my defiant maintaining of the sense 'kiss' for √*niṃs*, see comm. ad VIII.43.10. What does it mean for the dawns to "kiss" Agni like night? The simile is easier to decode: as dawn breaks at the horizon, it is in intimate physical/visual contact with the dark sky, contact that could be likened to kissing. Dawn's kissing of the ritual fire is more conceptual and temporal: the moment of dawn's appearance is when the fire is roused: this can count as contact. It is also possible, if the fire in question is the offering fire (as *puróhitam* implies), that the light of dawn spreading from the east first encounters and, as it were, touches that fire, which is of course stationed at the east end of the ritual ground.

The phrase *tánūnápātam aruṣásya* is, in my interpr., a piece of tricky syntax. The stem *tánū-nápāt-* is otherwise used as an epithet for Agni, almost always in the 2nd vs. of Āprī hymns, where the figure has taken on a (quasi-)independent existence. Here I think we should read it literally, with the sense 'descendant of (him)self / his own body'. In conjunction with immediately preceding *puróhitam* 'set in front / to the east', this is a designation of the offering fire, which has been *taken out* of the household fire to the west and carried eastward to be established there – it is a descendant of itself. I take gen. *aruṣásya* as doubling the cmpd's 1st member, *tánū-*: *aruṣá-* 'ruddy' frequently modifies Agni. Here it is an independent case form that has the same referent as the cmpd member *tánū-*. On this construction see my forthcoming "Limits on Indo-Iranian Compounding" (Ged. Gary Holland).

X.92.3: The first two vss. having been conceptually consistent and well-crafted, we now encounter the non sequitur quality that will characterize much of the rest of the hymn. The exclamation *báḍ* that opens the vs. may signal this change of direction.

I am utterly baffled by the first pāda: I don't understand what the Paṇi / niggard is doing here. Who would ever think that we would confuse the *nīthā́* of wise Agni with those of a Paṇi, and what is the point of contact between Agni and this figure, who belongs to a different mythic complex? The Paṇi finds a phonological near-match in *pánīyasī* 'more/very admirable' in the next vs. (4b), but this gets us nowhere.

Never mind – this theme disappears; the rest of the vs., incl. the next pāda, is unrelated. Pāda b concerns the pouring (of ghee) onto the wood for kindling. The pāda is notable for a periphrasis with an overt copula, *práhutā āsuḥ*, which is quite unusual esp. in a main clause (see my 1990 Predicated Past Participle); we would expect the bare ppl. What the ppl. + perfect is meant to express is unclear to me; one could speculate that it aims at a plupf. "had been bepoured," but there's no contextual support for this. Perhaps the publ. tr. ("have been bepoured") is correct, and the *āsuḥ* is meant to guard against both "are" and "were"and enforce an immediate past reading (with a perfect, because √*as* lacks an aor.).

There is some uncertainty about *vayā́(ḥ)*, my "twigs." Gr splits the stem into two (unnecessarily), with our form belonging to his "Opferspeise"; Ge (n. 3b) asserts that *vayā́-* are

otherwise not used as Brennholz, and we should perhaps read *avayā́ḥ* "Sühnopfer." Since *vayā́-* is not particularly frequent, I do not see the lack of other attestations in the sense of Brennholz as an impediment. Moreover, anyone who's ever tried to build a fire knows that twigs are far more useful in the early stages than logs. Perhaps Ge is reluctant to accept that *práhuta-* can modify the goal or target upon which something is poured rather than the substance poured, but Agni himself is often so designated (though usually with *ā́huta-*); see disc. above ad X.91.14.

But never mind again – the second hemistich appears to be entirely unrelated to either a or b; instead we have unnamed fearsome ones (*ghorā́saḥ*) reaching immortality and praising the gods. Old (fld. by Ge n. 3c and Re) identifies the subj. as the Aṅgirases, with good parallels, but the connection of cd with pādas a and b escapes me. On the A's reaching immortality see also X.62.1. As I comment there, the Aṅgirases "seem to be acting as if in the role of mortal sacrificers vis-à-vis Indra," and a similar situation may be depicted here, which would at least connect pāda c with the ritual fire kindling in b. For possible connections to 4a see comm. immed. below. I would make a small change in the tr. of c, to "they attained immortality," to better match 7a below.

X.92.4–5: Several phrasal (near-)repetitions knit these two vss. together, without giving significant help in the unraveling of the puzzles: *urú vyácaḥ* (4a) is a near-equivalent to *urú jráyaḥ* (5c), both pāda-final, and *mahy àrámatiḥ* (4b) appears as *mahī́m arámatīm* in 5b.

X.92.4: Ge and Re both take the whole vs. as a single sentence with *sáṃ cikitrire* (c) as the main verb and a miscellaneous list of subjects. This is syntactically impossible for the transmitted text, since *cikitrire* is unaccented and pāda a contains *hí*, which conditions verbal accent. Since 10d also contains *sáṃ cikitrire*, it could be argued that the verb here has lost its accent redactionally, to match 10d. But there is little to be gained by taking all of vs. 4 as a unit and perhaps a bit to be gained by imposing some internal structure.

The *hí* in pāda a could look either back (to the preceding vs.) or forward (to the rest of 4). I will tentatively and speculatively try the former. Since in 3cd the Aṅgirases attained immortality, which may have involved their moving to heaven, and they praised the divine race (*jánasya daívyasya*), I suggest that heaven in 4a picks up this theme, and I take pāda as an equational nominal sentence: Heaven (is) the *ṛtásya prásitiḥ*.

And what is this? Ge (n. 4a) claims that it is only a poetic paraphrase for *ṛtám*, but it seems unlikely that the poet would use a highly specific and fairly uncommon word like *prásiti-* in an essentially empty locution. On *prásiti-* and the two separate words it may represent, see comm. ad IV.4.1. As I say there, the dominant meaning is 'onslaught' derived from PIE **seh₁(i̯)* 'loslassen', but it seems in some contexts to mean '(hunting) net' (< √*sā, si* 'bind'). IV.4.1 contains two occurrences of *prásiti-*; the first is qualified as 'broad' (*pṛthvī́m*) and is the comparandum to *pā́jaḥ* 'leading edge', and I take it in the "net" meaning, with the net spread as wide as possible to catch as much as possible. Here too broadness is at issue: the *prásiti-* is equated with heaven "the broad expanse" (*urú vyácaḥ* [*pace* Re, I don't think the latter phrase evokes the earth]). I therefore suggest that Heaven is "the (hunting) net of truth" (Ge also "das Netz des Gesetzes") – what this means (in my view) is that Heaven captures and keeps the "truths," the true formulations and praise hymns directed its way. I would now therefore change the tr. to "For Heaven, the broad expanse, is the (hunting) net (/snare) of truth."

This interpr. leaves pāda b at loose ends. The two entities in it, Reverence and Devotion, could be lumped in with the gods listed in c and d, but these pious abstractions are of a different

type from the well-known gods in cd. In the publ. tr. I take the pāda as locating the two in heaven, and I have nothing better to offer here. Reverence and Devotion certainly have more in common with truth than with the embodied gods of cd, and the location of Devotion in heaven may be at issue in 5b (q.v.).

The comparative *pánīyasī* echoes the mysterious *paṇéś* in 3a, but I can't do anything with this fact.

The verb *sáṃ cikitrire* could be interpr. either as passive/intransitive "they are jointly perceived" or transitive in absolute usage "they jointly perceive." The former is adopted by Re ("... se sont signalés de concert") and JSK (DGRV II.86: "have shown themselves (to be) together"), against the publ. tr. and, probably, Ge ("sind eines Sinnes"). The latter sense is favored also by X.30.6 *sáṃ jānate mánasā sáṃ cikitre* "They are agreed in mind and they perceive alike." Although the middle pf. of √*cit* often has pass./intrans. sense, the preverb *sám* probably conditioned the middle voice of *cikitrire* despite its "active" semantics.

X.92.5: Although I usually disdain Lü's celestial rivers, in this case the *síndhavaḥ* do seem to be located in heaven / the midspace. If (as I suggest) Aramati in 4b is located in heaven, that's where the rivers need to be to run over her in 5b. And in cd they seem to be the source of the water with which the Earth-circling one besprinkles everything.

In pāda a the appearance of "journeying Rudra" (*rudréṇa yayínā*) associated with the rivers is a bit unexpected, but if it is (as I think) a reference to the Maruts, it fits the general sense of the verse better. Note first that "the Rudras, the Maruts" (*rudrā́ marútaḥ*) appear in the next vs. (6a). Note also a phrase in X.78.7 with rivers and an adj. 'coursing' (*yayī́-*) formed very like *yayín-*, but with the Maruts as referents, *siṅ́dhavo ná yayyàḥ* "(the Maruts) coursing like rivers." Although a grammatically singular *rudrá-* standing for the Maruts would be unusual, it would, I think, be interpretable (esp. since the Maruts are often referred to in the sg., as a *gaṇá-* 'flock, throng' or *śardha(s)-* 'troop') – and in the rainstorm context of the 2nd hemistich the Maruts make sense.

I don't know why the rivers "run across" (*tiráḥ ... dadhanvire*) Aramati; it sounds disturbingly as if they run her over. But perhaps the idea is that they go beyond the boundaries of heaven (where I've located Aramati in vs. 5) and into the midspace to become rain.

The choice of possible referents for *párijman-* is fairly wide: Ge favors Vāta (on the basis of VII.40.6), Sāy. Indra, but Ge (n. 5c) also suggest Parjanya, which I prefer. The phrase *párijmā pariyán* is almost an anagram of his name, and the description *róruvaj jaṭharé* "constantly rumbling in his belly" is more characteristic of a thunder god than a wind god.

X.92.6: *Pace* Old and Ge (n. 6a), I separate *krāṇā́* here from the adv. (old instr.) *krāṇā́* 'successfully' (see comm. ad I.58.3) and follow the Pp. reading *krāṇā́ḥ* as a nom. pl. m. root aor. middle part.

With Gr (apparently) and Ge, I take the referent of *ásurasya* to be Heaven, contra W.E. Hale (78), who suggests Rudra.

Most take *caṣṭe* as pass./intrans. 'is seen, appears' (Gr, Ge, Re, Hale), but as argued in the comm. ad X.74.2 (see also VIII.19.16), med. forms of √*cakṣ* are overwhelmingly transitive 'see', even when used without expressed obj. Forms of this root without preverb (as here) are quite rare, but are standardly transitive. Taking *caṣṭe* as 'sees' harmonizes it with (my interpr. of) med. *sáṃ cikitrire* (4c, 10d), to a different root but having the same general semantics. As for the sense here, I interpr. it as an interesting variant of the common trope that Varuṇa + Mitra (etc.)

see the activities of men through the eye of the sun, who travels the sky as their spy looking downward. Here the Maruts, who journey through the midspace, serve as alternative eyes of the Ādityan trio. As for the singular number of the verb, the RV allows either a plural or a singular verb for multiple singular subjects.

The stem(s) *árvaśa-* / *arvaśá-* is found only here. It is ordinarily taken as a deriv. of *árvan(t)-* 'steed' (see, e.g., AiG II.2.919–20, EWA s.v. *árvan-*). I don't understand the reason for the accent difference, and the sec. lit. (incl. AiG) offers no explanations.

X.92.7: The publ. tr. interpr. the loc. phrases in a and b as parallel, contra Ge and Re. I now think they are correct to separate them. Pāda b is identical to IV.41.6b, where it forms part of a series listing the elements at stake in a battle. I would now substitute "... they obtained their benefit in Indra, when the sight of the sun and the masculine nature of the bull (were at stake)."

The larger question is – who are the subjects of this vs.? There is a curious silence on this in all the sec. sources, save for Sāy., who identifies them as *stotāraḥ*. I suggest rather the Aṅgirases for several reasons. First, in 3c they obtained immortality (*amṛtatvám āśata*), with the same verb as here. Although "benefit" and "immortality" are obviously different, the phraseology is structurally the same. Furthermore, assuming that *nṛṣádana-* refers to the multiday ritual type known later as sattra ('sitting', session)(see comm. ad V.7.2), in the Vala myth the Aṅgirases participate in sattras that lead to the opening of the Vala cave. Against this identification is the fact that they are credited here with fashioning Indra's vajra; this is not otherwise a deed of the Aṅgirases, as far as I am aware – and in fact no other *plural* entities perform this action that I know of.

X.92.8: Ge and Re interpr. *sū́raḥ* as nom. sg. to *sū́ra-* and subj. of *rīramat*, Old (also Lub) instead as gen. or abl. to *svàr-*. Ge allows the possibility of the gen. in n. 8a; Gr seems not to register the form at all. Scar (559) allows both interpr. I take it as gen. to *svàr-*, with Indra the unnamed subj. of *rīramat.* Not only does it immediately follow a vs. with that same form (*sū́raḥ* 7b), but the 2nd sg. verb in the parallel I.121.13 *tváṃ sū́ro haríto rāmayaḥ* ... "you brought to a halt the tawny mares of the Sun" clearly slots *sū́raḥ* into the gen. Cf. also *sū́ryasya harítaḥ* (V.29.5, etc.) with unambig. gen. In our passage gen. *sū́raḥ* is somewhat inelegantly picked up by coreferential *asya*, but this can't be helped.

In c my distribution of the ablatives and genitives in a chain of dependencies follows Scar (559).

In d *stan* is good candidate for a general pres. reading of the injunc. (see KH 137).

X.92.9: For "show forth (praise)" for √*diś* see A. Nikolaev, "Showing Praise in Greek Choral Lyric and Beyond" (AJP 133 [2012]: 543–72), where he argues persuasively that this is an IE poetic idiom, found also in Greek, Latin, and possibly Hittite.

In the main clause in ab a dat. *tébhyaḥ* needs to be supplied, parallel to *rudrā́ya*, as antecedent to *yébhiḥ* in c. The referents are of course the Maruts, the sons/associates of Rudra. The adj. *evayā́vabhiḥ* also picks them out exclusively: the pl. forms of the rare stem(s) *evayā́(van)-* only characterize the Maruts, and see also the curiously formed *evayā́-marut-* in the refrain of V.87 (1–9); see also V.41.16.

The adj. *śiváḥ* here implicitly modifies Rudra – the only such occurrence in the RV, though it is used of other gods. The exclusive application of this adj. to Rudra and its transfer from epithet to god's name are post-RVic developments.

With Old I take *diváḥ* as a gen. characterizing the Maruts (see his parallels), rather than as an abl. specifying where Rudra is coming from (Ge, Re).

X.92.10: I take the point of this opaque vs. to be that because Bṛhaspati and his associates pass their fame on to their progeny (ab), the primal priest can perform the next step (c) – leading to the situation in d, where the gods and the Bhṛgus, legendary fire-priests, think and perceive alike. They are, as it were, on the same page because of the transfer of sacrificial know-how from the gods to mortals (or semi-mortals). But I am by no means certain of this interpr. In any case note the parallel verb forms in a *ábharanta ví* and c *ví dhārayat*, which suggest similar sequential actions. HPS (B+I 55–57) has a rather different interpr., though also generally centered on the primal priesthood.

With Old (and apparently HPS 55), in pāda a I read dat. *prajā́yai* against Pp. gen. *prajā́yāḥ*.

'Fame' (*śrávas-*) seems to have an extended meaning here – perhaps the knowledge/actions they are famous for.

'Those akin to soma / having soma as their relative' (*sómajāmayaḥ*, a hapax) are universally (Ge, Re, HPS) identified as the Aṅgirases (Sāy. as the All Gods); I have nothing better to offer, though the link between soma and the Aṅgirases does not seem to me to be strong. It is clearly the presence of Bṛhaspati that undergirds the identification.

The verb *ví dhārayat* in c lacks an overt object. I supply *śrávaḥ* from pāda a; as just indicated, I think the verbs signal sequential actions of the same type. Ge supplies "die Ordnung" (presumably an underlying cognate acc. **dhármā(ṇi)*), though the passages he cites (n. 10c) provide no support (and do not contain *dhárman-*); Re "les arrangements diverses (du monde)," without argument; HPS (55) "(die Welthälften)." All of these possibilities seem to me plucked from thin air, and I prefer to stick with an object that can be supplied from context.

As indicated above, I think that d expresses the harmony of mind and perception between gods and the mortal or semi-mortal Bhṛgus, but it would help if I were surer what exactly the Bhṛgus are doing here. Their standard role is as primal installers of the ritual fire (e.g., I.58.3, II.4.2, VI.15.2), but this signature action is not in evidence here. However, they do seem to be associated with the Atharvan and the first institution of the sacrifice in c and to share their sacrificial skill with the gods.

On *sáṃ cikitrire* see comm. ad vs. 4. The repetition of this verb might make it tempting to see a demarcative ring structure, but nothing else about vss. 4–10 suggests that these vss. form a discrete section.

X.92.11: This vs. presents us with the same syntactic problem as vs. 4: a first pāda containing *hí*, a long list of ill-assorted divinities in the nominative, and a single finite verb (*arhire* in d) that lacks an accent. Once again most tr. take the vs. as a single sentence, despite the disharmony between the particle *hí* and the unaccented verb, and in this case the publ. tr. succumbed to the same temptation. Unfortunately it is more difficult to impose internal structure than it was in vs. 4 (see comm. there). The vs. also seems an intrusion between 10 and 12, which both, however obscurely, seem to concern priests and sacrifice. Because of the jumble of divine names and the lack of any connection to the surrounding context, I am therefore more willing to assume that the vs. is a haphazard assemblage of gods inserted into an All God hymn, where it would find a natural home, and that syntactic niceties were not honored. The fact that the verb *arhire* is morphologically anomalous – a perfect apparently without redupl. and medial to a root otherwise

active – contributes to the sense that the vs. was carelessly produced. On this verb form see Kü (108); though he entertains the possibility that it might exhibit archaic reduplication, in the end he favors an analysis as an ad hoc formation, possibly influenced by neighboring forms in *-ire* (by which he presumably means *cikitrire* in 10d [/ 4c]). The presence of *hí* in pāda a may result from simple repetition of the opening of vs. 10 (*té hí*), which is reproduced at the beginning of 11. There is also a little formula #*té hí dyā́vāpṛthivī́* ... (I.160.1, X.64.14), which may have contributed.

The b.v. *bhū́ri-retas-* 'having abundant semen' occurs 3x in the RV, always modifying *dyā́vāpṛthivī́*. As Re implies by his parenthetical tr. "(divinités feminines)," the application of this epithet to a grammatical feminine is a nice paradox.

The identity / application of *cáturaṅgaḥ* 'four-square' is unclear: Gr implies that it modifies *nárāśaṃsaḥ*; Sāy. and Bergaigne in different ways apply it to fire (see Ge n. 11b), while Ge himself expresses no opinion. Re claims that it's Varuṇa, because he has the epithet *cátur-anīka-* 'four-faced'. However, this word occurs only once, in V.48.5, where (*pace* Re) it in fact characterizes Agni (Varuṇa appears in a different pāda), so that the Sāy. / Bergaigne intuition seems closer to the mark. But in a list like this, the referent scarcely matters.

I tr. Rodasī (contra Ge and Re: Heaven and Earth / the two Worlds) because of the accent (*rodasī́*, not *ródasī*) and because Heaven and Earth are already represented in this list. Rodasī is also the consort of the Maruts, who are adjacent to her here – but in a list of such chaos their adjacency is almost an argument against!

X.92.12: A different priestly title, Uśij, appears here, identified with "us." If, as I suggest ad vs. 11, this vs. should follow directly on 10, the transfer of priestly skill and knowledge has passed from gods to legendary priestly figures (in vs. 10) to us of the present day. The *utá* opening this vs. would signal this chaining with vs. 10, and the *syá* may suggest that the referent is current.

All the standard renderings take pāda a with b and c, all loosely construed with the sg. verb *śṛṇotu*. By contrast I separate pāda a as a nominal clause – for several reasons. For one thing, b is identical to X.64.4d, which speaks against integrating our pāda a into it, with Ahi Budhnya identified as the *kaví*. Moreover the adv. *urviyā́* in pāda a hints at internal structure. I take the *kavíḥ* to be Agni (as so often) and *urviyā́* as signaling an unexpressed verb. Cf. *urviyā́ vy àdyaut* of Agni in III.1.18, X.45.8; *urviyā́ ví paprathe* of him in X.69.2. In the publ. tr. I supply "is widely perceptible," but, on the basis of those passages, "has shown widely" or "has spread widely" is also possible. The gen. *naḥ uśíjām* marks Agni as our own sacrificial fire.

In the publ. tr. I take the call (*hávīman-*) in b to be Agni's; I now think it's quite possibly that of us, the Uśij priests (so explicitly Re), since the Uśij priests are elsewhere associated with the production of a *śáṃsa-* 'laud', incl. in the related vs. II.31.6 (see below); see comm. ad II.31.6. I suggest a minimally altered alternative "listen to (our) call."

With most tr., I take the dual phrase in c as an expansion of b, with Sun and Moon the afterthought subjects of the 3rd ps. impv. *śṛṇotu* in b, with number mismatch. Alternatively the pāda could connect with d, which has a dual verb that fits the number of *sū́ryāmā́sā* better, but in that case we would prefer a voc. Sun and Moon. (Of course, a simple erasure of the accent on *-mā́sā* would produce a voc.)

In d *śamīnahuṣī* is a problem. At least since Roth, the verse has been compared with II.31.6 and the opening of this pāda compared with the phrase in II.31.6d *dhiyā́ śámi*#, a phrase that also occurs in X.40.1 (also pāda-final) and pāda-initial with non-shortened final vowel in IX.74.7 #*dhiyā́ śámī*. Roth's invocation of II.31.6 is esp. apposite because the vs. contains other

elements found in our vs. (as he notes) – particularly the Uśij priests (a) and Ahi Budhnya (b). It is therefore tempting (and, I think, correct) to read *dhiyā̆ *śámī nahuṣī …*, with word boundary and accentuation of *śámī*, tr. the first two words as "with visionary thought and ritual labor." (In the publ. tr. an asterisk should be inserted before "ritual labor.") The alternative is to take *śamī-nahuṣī* as a voc. dvandva "o Śamī (and) Nahuṣī" (so Ge and Re) – but though Nahus at least is a PN elsewhere (though not Nahuṣī), Śamī is not. Ge (n. 12d) suggests that it's personified Ritual Labor, but given the existence of the bipartite instr. formulaic phrase *dhiyā̆ śámī*, this seems unnec. and farfetched. What then to do with *nahuṣī* – if that's the correct form (Roth emends to *náhuṣo*)? I would like to (and in fact do in the publ. tr.) interpret it as an elliptical dual dvandva in the voc. to the stem *náhus-*. The problem is the gender: we should expect masc. du. voc. **nahuṣā*. The only explanation I can offer for the *-ī* is perseveration from *śamī* in an unclear context, which I realize is weak. (Ge and Re simply assume a name Nahuṣī; I suppose this is possible, but it simply multiplies elements and also assumes a feminine addressee, which is unlikely if not impossible.) If, as I think, *nahuṣī* is an elliptical dual, what is the other member? In the publ. tr. I suggest Manu, on the basis of X.80.6, where people born from Manu and Nahus (*mánuṣo náhuṣo ví jātā̆ḥ*) invoke Agni (cf. also X.99.7). Here they would be legendary performers, who both engage in ritual activity (through their *dhī-* and *śámī-*) and take cognizance of the ritual of today.

The referent of accented *asyá* is not clear. I'm now somewhat inclined to accept Ge's suggestion (Nachtr. ad loc.) that it is the singer (sim. Re), who has not yet been mentioned in the discourse. However, given the relatively frequency of expressions like I.147.2 *bódhā me asyá vácasaḥ* "take heed of this speech of mine," with gapping of the noun in, e.g., the refrain of I.105 *vittám me asyá* "take heed of this (speech) of mine," it may instead be a reference to the speech/poem itself.

X.92.13: In the first hemistich I take *carátham* (a) as obj. of the inf. *iṣṭáye* (b) ("to seek our movable goods"), despite their distance, because *carátha-* in the acc. is generally used of "moveable (goods)" → "livestock." This is contrary to the Ge/Re interpr., both of whom take *carátham* and *iṣṭáye* as separate complements of *prá … avatu*, with *carátha-* an abstract meaning something like "movement." Although I recognize that the two words I construe together are far apart, my interpr. avoids the problem that Ge/Re face: to supply something else as complement of the inf. *iṣṭáye* ("dass wir rasch (zum Ziele) kommen"; "pour (faire réussir notre) quête (de biens)").

The stem *ātmán-* here has its original (?) meaning 'breath' (see EWA s.v.), appropriate to its identification with Vāta 'Wind', as is agreed by all standard tr.

Although the neut. of the comparative *vásyaḥ* ordinarily means 'better state', the machinery that Ge and (esp.) Re ("pour (qu'il nous obtienne) un (sort) meilleur" – a lot of words to tr. one) require to employ that sense here makes me prefer my economical adverbial interpr. "all the more."

X.92.14: As is generally agreed, the main object of praise in this vs. is Agni, save for pāda c, where we find Aditi and the Wives (of the gods).

On *adhikṣít-* see esp. Ge (n. 14) and Scar (94). Although I agree that this rt noun cmpd belongs primarily to √*kṣi* 'dwell', I think there is some crossover with √*kṣā* 'rule' – hence my tr. 'preside over' (borrowed from Re), which splits the semantic difference. Although verb forms of

this lexeme sometimes just mean ‘dwell’ (I.126.1, 154.2), ‘preside over’ works better for VII.96.2 and VIII.40.2, 41.9.

On *anarváṇam*, see esp. comm. ad VIII.31.12 as well as other loci noted in the lexical commentary. The problem is that this adj. several times modifies, or seems to modify, feminines despite its masc. appearance. Although in these cases ad hoc fixes can be contrived by finding (or inventing) a masc. for it to modify, the fact that there is a group of such passages strongly suggests that the adjectives in each case are actually fem. On this passage esp., see JPB (Ādityas 218–19), where he convincingly argues that acc. *anarváṇam* is built to a fem. **e*-grade *n*-stem like *yóṣan-* ‘young woman’, whose nom. pl. is *yóṣaṇaḥ*. Our *anarváṇam* would be the correct acc. sg. to such a stem, next to nom. sg. fem. *anarvā́* (II.40.6, VII.40.4).

áktoḥ is formally a genitive, and it is universally (incl. in the publ. tr.) taken as dependent on *yúvānam ... pátim* here. However, the form is often used adverbially (“by night”), as in our own 1b, and I think that usage is possible here.

nṛmáṇā(ḥ) is most likely a nom. sg. (but see Old for other poss.) and is taken by most as the name of the poet, while I (and Scar [94]) prefer to take it in its usual adjectival sense (‘of manly mind’). By either interpr. we must reckon with an unsignaled change in number from 1st pl. *gṛṇīmasi* in b, either to 1st sg. or 3rd sg., and must supply the appropriate verb (“I/he hymn(s)”). With Scar, I prefer the first alt., because it involves changing only one grammatical category (number), not two (number + person), but Ge and Re opt for 3rd sg.

On *ádha* conjoining two nominals (here *áditim* and *yúvānam ... pátim*), see JSK (DGRV II.128–29).

X.92.15: On my interpr. of the meaning of √*ribh*, see the various reff. listed in the index to the lexical comm.

Both Ge and Re consider the *pū́rvo áṅgirā(ḥ)* to be Bṛhaspati, but in the sg. *áṅgiras-* is almost always Agni, who is also the subject of the previous vs. (14) and so the default referent in context. The identification with Bṛhaspati is vigorously disputed by HPS (B+I 38, 56), who favors Agni or possibly Soma.

In c, because of the agency of the stones and because of the insistence on *ví* (*víhāyā(ḥ) ... vicakṣaṇáḥ*), I render *víhāyā ábhavat* as “became widely extended,” flg. Re’s “a pris toute son extension” rather than my usual tr. of *víhāyas-* as ‘of extensive power’. The point is surely that when pounded by the stones, the soma plant and its juices spread out physically, just as its power becomes more extensive because it has been transformed into the deified ritual drink.

The final pāda of this hymn is, as Re says, “finale mystérieuse.” Syntactically it must consist of two nominal sentences of two words each. Ge (n. 15d) plausibly suggests that it has to do with an animal sacrifice. As he points out, *pā́thaḥ* ‘fold’ (as in ‘sheepfold’), ‘pen’ is associated with the animal sacrifice in the horse sacrifice hymn (I.162.2) and in the Āprī hymns, where after being sacrificed the animal victim “goes to the pen of the gods” (*áthā devā́nām ápy etu pā́thaḥ* II.3.9, et sim.) The second clause, *svádhitir vánanvati*, is the positive equivalent of the negative *ná svádhitir vánanvati* in VIII.102.19 (as is generally remarked). In that context it seemed simply to indicate that the speaker did not have firewood for kindling the ritual fire; whether the axe here has more sinister associations (with the killing of the animal) isn’t clear.

X.93 All Gods

On the manifold difficulties in this hymn and the universal near-contempt for it (which I'm afraid I share), see publ. intro. I will not engage with the numerous metrical problems, and will scant many of the morphological and syntactic issues.

X.93.1: On the problematic *máhi*, see esp. Old, Ge (n. 1a).

The instr. pls. *tébhiḥ ... ebhíḥ* most likely refer to the gods; see Ge (n. 1c).

The hapax *śūṣáṇi* is unclear. Ge takes it as a loc. inf. to √*śū* (flg. Gr), tr. "... schützet uns, um überlegen zu sein" (cf. Keydana, *Inf* 111: "damit wir gedeihen"). But can loc. infinitives express purpose, and, if we are its subj. (most clearly in Keydana's tr.), why do we need protection? Re's interpr. is quite similar ("pour que (nous soyons) gonflés (de biens)"), though he analyses it as "une variante inorganique de *śūṣá*" (whatever that means) rather than an inf. By contrast, Th (see EWA s.v. *śūṣá-*) derives it from < **(p)śū-ṣa* = YAves. *fšū-ša-* 'winning cattle'. Clever – but again, why would we need protection in those circumstances. I (tentatively) suggest that the referent is the same as that of *sáhyas-* 'one more powerful', the person from whom we needed protection in the preceding pāda, and it's a loc. absol. referring to circumstances ("when he [=the more powerful one] is swollen with strength"). Ge suggests a similar alt. in his n. 1d.

X.93.2: This vs. is syntactically and morphologically well-behaved; not so its meter.

X.93.3: Although the default assumption would be that the two pāda-initial gen. pl. #*víśveṣām ...* #*devā́nām* should be construed together, esp. in an All God hymn, the parallel in VIII.46.16 *víśveṣām irajyántam vásūnām* (*pace* Ge's "nur zufällig") suggests a different configuration, with *víśveṣām* dependent on the voc. *irajyavaḥ* and *devā́nām* on *vā́r* (as in the publ. tr). Very little is at issue, however, if the two are taken together and construed with *vā́r* as in Ge's "Aller Götter Schutz is grossartig, ihr Gebieter." I do not see how Re gets a voc. "o tous dieux" out of this gen. phrase; he clearly thinks it's coreferential with *irajyavaḥ*, which he tr. "O vous qui commandez," but how?

Note the four occurrences of *víśva-* (/*viśvá*-X) in the vs.

X.93.4: Pāda b is identical with I.79.3c. The referent of *párijmā* is unclear. It could be an epithet of Varuṇa, but in I.79.3 I take it as Wind on the basis of VII.40.6 (see comm. ad loc.). But here the word needs to be evaluated in the context of the preceding hymn (X.92.5), which contains an occurrence of *párijmā*. As disc. in the comm. on that vs. above, I identify that occurrence with Parjanya, but other referents have been suggested. Since it is found in a god list here, there's nothing that depends on a precise identification.

It is not clear whether the scope of the question particle *kád* extends over all the gods listed in the 2nd hemistich (Ge, Re) or only Rudra (publ. tr.) – nor is it clear why there is any question about him/them. Perhaps Rudra is singled out because his nature is not completely benevolent, as opposed to the others on the list; c could be a parenthetical "Is Rudra praised of men?" Such special treatment of Rudra may be supported by 7a below.

The form *pūṣánaḥ* is of course surprising: formally it could be nom. pl. (so Re: "Pūṣan-et-autres"), but is far more likely (so Old, citing Lanman; see Ge n. 4d) to be a nom. sg., backformed from the acc. *pūṣánam*; see esp. the matching expression *pūṣánaṃ bhágam* # in X.125.2 cited by Old.

X.93.5–7: These three vss. begin *utá no* and appear to form a tṛca. All three also concern the Aśvins (at least by my interpr.).

X.93.5: Ge calls this a "fast unverstandlichen Str.," and it has received a wide variety of interpr. (see esp. Old's multiple alternatives). I will primarily deal with my own, by no means certain, account.

Let us begin with the voc. *vṛṣaṇvasū*. This fairly common form, always in the dual, is overwhelmingly used of the Aśvins. Given the Aśvin theme of the following two vss, which are linked to this one by their opening (see immed. above), that is surely the referent here, despite the dual dvandva *sū́ryāmā́sā* that opens the next pāda.

The two words in the middle of this 1st pāda, *náktam apā́m*, give trouble. Ge's interpr. (n. 5) is the most radical: noting that Apām Napāt is found often (his term; the occurrences don't seem that numerous to me) in conjunction with Ahi Budhnya, he suggests emending *náktam* to **náptam*, yielding the acc. phrase **náptam apā́m*. The problem (or one of them) is that **náptam* is not the acc. to *nápāt-*, which is always (20x) *nápātam*. Although it is true that nom. *apā́ṃ nápāt* is found in the preceding hymn (X.92.13), directly after a vs. containing Ahi Budhnya (X.92.12), this does not seem sufficient reason to make a radical emendation yielding a non-existent form. I take *náktam* as an adverbial acc. 'by night', as so often, and supply its formulaic partner 'by day', to match up with the Sun-and-Moon dvandva in b.

As for *apā́m* Old construes it with the voc. *vṛṣaṇvasū*, on what seem to me weak grounds. Re, while not accepting Ge's emendation, nonetheless sneaks in *nápāt-* in parentheses: "... la Nuit, (le Fils) des eaux ..." Flg. Gr's laconic indication, I take this gen. instead with *sádanāya* in the next pāda (so also Scar 29), though this connection is explicitly rejected by Old). For a similar phrase, see *apā́ṃ sadhásthe* (I.149.4, II.4.2 = X.46.2, VI.52.15). The gen. *apā́m* may have been moved from the immed. vicinity of its head noun to enable the phonetic figure *sádanāya sadhanyā̆* (/ ... *śā́di*) in b (/c).

Now, what is the overall structure of the hemistich? Most interpr. supply a verb: "bring" (Ge, JSK [DGRV I.426]) or "protect" (Old tentatively, Re), with Sun and Moon (+/- other acc.s) as acc. obj. By contrast but with Scar (291), I take the hemistich as a nominal clause, with *sū́ryāmā́sā* as subj. and *sadhanyā̆* 'joint guides' predicated of them. There are problems with this: first, it requires separating *sadhanyā̆* here from forms like *sadhanitvá-* (see comm. ad IV.1.9, VI.51.3, also X.50.3), which I now take as deriv. from *sa-dhána-* (flg. Scar), and maintaining the root noun cmpd analysis *sadha-nī́-* 'leading jointly'; it also assumes a dat. (*sádanāya*) goal with this cmpd, which is syntactically shaky; and it posits an unusual configuration: Sun and Moon leading us to the seat of the waters. I am not certain what this refers to – but Agni is elsewhere associated with the seat of the waters, and so perhaps this describes the daily ritual round as defined by the alternation of Sun (day) and Moon (night).

The referent of *eṣā́m* is undetermined; it cannot be the waters, the only plural entity in the 1st hemistich, because of gender mismatch. Old and Ge suggest the gods, which is a reasonable default.

X.93.6: A relaxingly straightforward vs. The only real question is what is the referent of *sá* in c. The pāda is identical to I.149.1 (or, rather, is the dimeter version of a Virāj pāda there). The standard, and most likely, view of our pāda is that the (or a) (mortal) whom the gods protect in ab is the referent of *sá* (Ge, Re, Bl [ad I.149.1]), but in I.149.1 the referent is most likely Agni, who is not excluded here.

X.93.7: The agglomeration of gods in this vs. becomes more random. The first puzzle is found in pāda a, where the Aśvins are called on for mercy, "even though (*cid*) [they are] Rudras." The Aśvins are called Rudras in a number of other passages (e.g., I.158.1, II.41.7), as Ge points out (n. 7a), but without the deprecatory concessive of this passage. This (positive/neutral) identification must be via the Maruts, who as Rudra's sons are also called Rudras (pl.). The Aśvins share the midspace with the Maruts and on several occasions (e.g., VIII.22.1, 14) are called *rudrá-vartanī* 'following the course of the Rudras [=Maruts]'. Since the Rudra=Aśvins identification is mediated through the positively viewed Maruts, there are no bad associations. Here, by contrast, the ambivalence about the Aśvins as Rudras seems to connect with 4c, where I suggest there is some question about whether Rudra is/should be praised, given his often hostile spirit and behavior. See comm. above. With regard to this vs. one might note that Rudra is not known for his mercy.

On *ráthaspati-* see comm. ad V.50.5.

The Earth-encircler (*párijmā*) recurs from 4b (q.v.), as well as X.92.5.

The voc. *viśvavedasaḥ* in d is a semi-scrambling of *víśve devā́saḥ* in b.

X.93.7–8: There is chaining between 7c *ṛbhúr vā́ja ṛbhukṣaṇaḥ* and 8a *ṛbhúr ṛbhukṣā́ ṛbhúḥ*.

X.93.8: The standard tr. take *te* [=Indra] in b as the antecedent of the rel. *yásya* introducing cd. Although this is the most straightforward analysis, I disfavor it because the clauses in cd seem to characterize a ritual performer, not Indra. I therefore take b as a parenthetical interjection, supplying an impv. "(let ... come)," with Ge and Re. The *yásya* then is coreferential or parallel to the gen. *vidhatáḥ* in pāda a: "of the one who does honor (and) of whom ..." In d the sacrifice and its accoutrements of the present sacrificer are compared to those of the first sacrificer, Manu.

X.93.9: Another fairly hopeless vs., of which I've made what sense I can.

In pāda a, with Old, Ge, and apparently Re, I take *áhrayaḥ* as a negated neut. *s*-stem, next to the them. adj. *áhraya-* (11x, not counting this one) 'immoderate, unabashed'. This *s*-stem is also probably found in IX.54.1 (q.v), though there it is usually taken as a nom. pl. m. to a hapax stem *áhri-*. Here *áhrayaḥ* would have to be a nom. sg. if to the them. adj.; it would then have to modify the addressee, Savitar, and would deprive *kṛdhī́* of an obj. As an *s*-stem deriv., it could be either a noun 'immoderation' or a bahuvrīhi adj., as Ge points out (n. 9a). (The occurrence in IX.54.1 is an adj. modifying *páyas-*.) In either case it is likely to reference n. *rā́dhas-* 'wealth, largesse', which is modified by *áhraya-* 5x (though in our passage Ge, Re, and JSK [DGRV I.228] take it simply as the abstract 'lack of shame'). As a minor alt. to the publ. tr. "immoderation (of wealth)" with *áhrayaḥ* as noun, we could have "immoderate (wealth)" with an adjectival form. For the accent, cf. the b.v. *án-āgas-* 'without offense'.

In b the grammatical identity and function of *stuṣe* are in question. Ge, Re (explicitly), and JSK take it as a 3rd sg. passive 'is/should be praised' (or [JSK 229] possibly a "falsely unaccented infinitive"). The subj. would be *sá*, but its referent is unclear: the consensus is that he is one from among the (gen. pl.) *maghónām* 'patrons'. I prefer to take *stuṣe* as the form it usually is, one of the well-known group of *-se* 1st sgs. with "active" sense in the domain of praising (*gṛṇīṣe*, etc.). See comm. ad I.122.7–8, X.22.1.

The *sá* could be one of the extremely rare RVic examples of the *sá /tám* pronoun doubling the 1st ps., rather than the far more common 2nd (see my 1992 [HS 105] "*sá* figé"

article, esp. pp. 217, 230–31). However, given that the function of *ca* in this pāda is uncertain (see JSK 229) and further that JSK (272 n. 110) lists this as one of only four passages in the RV containing the sequence *sá/tá- ca*), I suggest that instead of *sá ca* we read **sácā* 'along with, in company with', here to be construed with the gen. *maghónām*. See *sácā ... eṣām* in 5c. The emendation is slight: the erasure of the notional word boundary of course means nothing in the Saṃhitā text, and since the 2nd vowel precedes a cluster (*st-*), a redactional shortening would be easy and have no metrical consequences. In the publ. tr. there should be an asterisk before "in company with." A **sácā* here could parallel the *sahá* + *u* that opens the next pāda (as *sahó*) and indeed give the *u* there something to do. In fact, JSK (Part. *u*, 169 n. 3) classifies our *sahó* among forms where the existence of an *u* is unlikely because it is found in a passage lacking a proper syntactic environment for *u* ; however, if it links *sácā* and *sahá*, it belongs with JSK's *u* linking a series of adverbs (his Chap. 7) and the *u* has much better contextual support.

The second hemistich is fairly impenetrable; Ge says of his tr. (n. 9cd) "Nur versuchsweise übersetzt." My tr. rests on a double interpr. of the lexeme *ní √yu*. On the one hand, it can be used with the object 'wealth' (*ráyim* vel sim.) in the sense "hitch up wealth (like a team)" – see VII.92.3 (*niyúdbhiḥ ...) ní no rayím ... yuvasva* "with your teams, hitch up wealth for us" (sim. VII.5.9, also VII.40.2). On the other hand, *ní √yu* can mean 'rein in, control', as in X.42.5, where "rivals" (*śátrūn*) are the obj.; see also *úd √yu*, with the oppositional preverb to *ní*, in the opposing sense 'give free rein to' (VI.57.6). Both the positive and the negative semantic extensions of *ní √yu* start from the etymological figure *niyútaḥ ní √yu* 'team/hitch up teams', as in VII.91.5 *niyuvānā̆ niyútaḥ*. My "Indra keeps hitching up (wealth) for these (patrons) of ours and keeps hold of 'the wheel of the domains' like a rein" represents both idioms. Unfortunately in the "wealth" idiom the object has to be supplied; in my view the gen. pl. *eṣām* refers to the patrons from b (so also Ge, n. 9c) and is distinct from the gen. pl. *carṣaṇīnā̆m* immed. flg. the pāda break. As for "the wheel of the domains" (*carṣaṇīnā̆m cakrám*), Ge (n. 9d) takes the wheel as "das Symbol der Herrschaft," as in later India. Although the first idiom is minimally represented here, I find it difficult to render the whole hemistich without incorporating it.

X.93.10: Again with Ge (n. 9c), I take *eṣu* as referring to the patrons; however, I do not consider it coreferential with *vīréṣu* as Ge and Re do, but as identifying two distinct groups. I also take *asmé* not as another term in that series (like Re's "en ces hommes-d'élite, en nous-mêmes"), but as defining the larger group in which the *vīrá-* are found. However, little rides on this distinction.

The position of *utá* in d is somewhat disquieting. It conjoins the two bipartite datival purpose NPs *vā̆jasya sātáye* (c) and *rāyā̆ ... turváṇe* (d), but takes second position in the second phrase, as if it were *ca*. JSK (DGRV I.301) simply says it "takes enclitic position within its phrase," which is a description, not an explanation. However, I don't see any other way to construe it, and in the context of this hymn it's a minor issue. (On instr. *rāyā̆* see Old.)

X.93.11: The first hemistich lacks a verb. It's possible to borrow *pāhi* from c, as Re does. But I prefer to supply a verb of motion, probably **yāhi*, rhyming with *pāhi* – both because *asmayú-* is several times found with this impv. (I.135.2 (2x), IX.14.8, 64.18; also (dual) VII.74.4, VIII.26.14) and because *kū̆cit sántam* "wherever it may be" invites a verb of motion.

Pāda d can be (and has been) variously interpreted. The standard view (so Ge, Re) sees *medátām* as a 3rd sg. mid. impv. to a hapax 6th cl. pres. with anomalous full-grade root vocalism (or else what should be a 1st cl. pres. with anomalous suffixal accent – see Ge's n. 11d, where he suggests *medátām* is an error for **médatām*), beside the *ya*-pres. *médyati*, which has a broader

attestation (on which see Kulikov, *ya*-pres. 599). By contrast, Old suggests that it's a *tā*-abstract and hesitates whether it belongs with *medín-* 'pal' (not his gloss!) or *médas-* 'fat', tr. "beschütze unser Genossentumswesen (unser fettes Gedeihen?) entsprechend unserm Weisheitswese." The nominal interpr. has been widely accepted; see EWA s.v. *médas-*, Lub. In *-áya*-Formations (142 n. 78) I accept Old's interpr. and tr. "For (our) superiority do thou always protect our prosperity with wisdom" (in both tr. the verb *pāhi* of c reapplies). In the publ. tr. I revert to the older view of *medátām* as a verb, but interpr. *vedátā* as a nom. sg., not the instr. sg. others take it to be, belonging to √*vid* 'find, acquire' rather than √*vid* 'know'. (Note that, like *medátām*, *vedátā* is a hapax: the forms seem to have been created to mutually interact with each other.) My reversion was in great part caused by the position of the 2nd *abhíṣṭaye* at the end of c (the first ending b). This "final" dative seems to me to be rhetorically final, and a new clause should begin in d. Nonetheless I have had partial second thoughts about positing a hapax pres. stem beside an already existent one, and so I now suggest as alt. the tr. cited above from my *-áya*-book (with "dominance" substituted for "superiority").

X.93.12: Another challenging vs. Its opening, *etám me stómam*, echoes that of the previous vs. (11a), *etáṃ śáṃsam*. This parallelism was not, regrettably, signaled in the publ. tr.

The rest of the hemistich is disputed. Ge (n. 12a, fld. without remark by Re) takes *tanā́* as a nom. sg. fem., which in the phrase *tanā́ ... sū́rye*, is the Daughter of the Sun (equivalent to *sū́re duhitā́*, acdg. to him). This seems extraordinarily bold, in fact reckless. There exists no *tanā́* 'daughter' (or other such female figure); *sū́rye* has no claim to a genitive interpr., unlike *sū́re*; and the Daughter of the Sun has no obvious role in this vs. (though Ge claims she has a relationship to poetry). There has to be a better way, although I admit that mine has its share of awkwardness. I take the simile *tanā́ ná sū́rye* as an unusually constructed comparandum to the b.v. *dyutád-yāman-* 'whose course is dazzling'. I take *tanā́* as the instr. of the rt noun *tán-* 'extension'. Although the instr. sg. of this stem generally has root accent (*tánā*) and an adverbial sense ("in full measure," "at length," etc.), I suggest that the form here retains the expected ending accent because it has the full nominal sense "by stretching." In this reading, *sū́rye* is the goal, and the point is that as the praise-song is sent towards heaven, its trajectory is as bright as a sunbeam or a flame of the fire reaching aloft.

The subj. of *vāvṛdhanta* is unexpressed. Because this vs. contains the poet's praise of his own composition (in my view) and because it provides the transition to the dānastuti, I suggest it is the patrons, who have been gestured to in recent vss. (9–10) and will return (in 13, as well as 14–15). They "strengthen" the poet's praise hymn by their material gifts to him. This verb is unusual in that medial forms of √*vṛdh* are overwhelmingly intransitive; this is only one of three forms of the med. pf. that Kü (471–72) identifies as transitive (and one of these, V.69.1, is not, by my interpr.). I would suggest that *vāvṛdhanta* here is an *-anta* replacement of the type I have discussed, and so has active function (as opposed to the three other exx. of *vāvṛdhánta*, which are in fact intrans.).

Despite the two simile particles (*ná* c, *iva* d), the 2nd hemistich must be a single simile, as Old points out. *saṃvánana-* is generally (and surely correctly) understood as a piece of horse or wagon tackle; its literal sense, 'harmonizer, conciliator', is probably euphemistic for something that keeps horses under control.

X.93.13: With Ge (see n. 13ab), fld. by Re (Old's speculations seem off the mark), I take the unidentified gen. pl.s *yéṣām* and *eṣāṃ* as referring to the patrons and the unidentified nom. sg. f.

(on the basis of the f. adj. *yuktā́* and *hiraṇyáyī*) as the Dakṣinā. This vs. thus introduces the dānastuti, which becomes more explicit in the flg. vs. Both *vāvárta* and *yuktā́* suggest that the Dakṣinā here is conceived of as a chariot or wagon.

It is the second hemistich that provides the problems in this vs. It consists of two (or possibly one: see comm. ad 12cd) similes, to which the fem. entity in the 1st hemistich is presumably compared, but everything else is up for grabs. See the despairing flounderings of Old, Ge (n. 13cd), and Re, to which I have nothing particularly useful to add. The general impression I get from the two similes is that the feminine subj. of ab is being deliberately compared (and thus contrasted) with hypermasc., aggressive, and successful entities, esp. in c with *paúṃsyā* 'manly, masculine'. As with *paúṃsyāni* in I.169.6 I take this as referring to manly forces, i.e., troops. Here the ending *-ā* can be either a fem. sg. or the short neut. pl. On *nemá-dhiti-*, here in the loc. as in its other 3 occurrences, see comm. ad I.72.4. It is used of battle arrays drawn up against the enemy. In other words, the Dakṣiṇā of ab seems to be compared to troops in a state of combat readiness – I have no idea why.

The sense of d is even harder to fathom because the b.v. *viṣṭá-anta-* is multiply ambiguous and the morphological identity and meaning of *vṛ́thā* are disputed. As for the former, *viṣṭá-* can of course be the ppl. either of √*viś* 'enter' or √*viṣ* 'toil, accomplish'. Gr takes it to √*viś*, glosses 'hindurchgehende Enden habend', and applies it to an axle, presumably qualifying the chariot that is the hidden metaphor in ab. This doesn't get us very far, esp. since it leaves *vṛ́thā* dangling. Old tries out several possibilities but doesn't settle on one. Ge refuses to tr. My rendering is closest to Re's (for the whole pāda) "semblable à des choses accomplies de bon gré," but I think both of our interpr. rest on a dubious cross-linguistic slippage: the assumption that 'end' (*ánta-*) can also mean 'goal'. Nonetheless this is reflected in the publ. tr. "whose ends have been accomplished" (with *viṣṭá-* from √*viṣ*). However dubiously achieved, this interpr. makes more sense than introducing an axle, and it fits fairly well with c, in comparing the Dakṣiṇā to something successful. It also allows *vṛ́thā* to have its usual adverbial sense 'at will', rather than taking it (with Sāy. and Ge; see Ge's n. 13cd) as a separate fem. noun, which Ge renders as "Schöpfrad" (whatever that may be).

Thus, piece by piece the 2nd hemistich can be tentatively teased out, but the point of the two similes still escapes me.

X.93.14: The first hemistich consists of a list of patrons' names in the loc., summed up by *maghávatsu*. This stem first appeared in gen. pl. *maghónām* in 9a; in between the patrons have been regularly alluded to, but not overtly identified. The reappearance of *maghávan(t)-* here almost defines a ring.

The syntax of cd is problematic. It should consist of a rel. cl. introduced by *yé* picked up by a main cl containing the referent of *yé*, namely *eṣām* (both referring to the patrons) (see the similar configuration in 13ab). The problem (or one of them) is that the "main" clause in which *eṣām* finds itself has an accented verb, *viśrā́vi*. The various treatments attempt various makeshifts. In mine, I supply a transitive verb of motion in the rel. cl. ("send"), because *yuktvā́ya* 'having yoked' assumes a subsequent journey, as does *pathā́* (if it belongs in this clause), and *asmayú* also favors a verb of motion (see comm. ad 11).

As I just implied, I am inclined to breach the pāda boundary (not much of a problem in this metrically messy hymn) and include *pathā́* in the rel. cl., though it could belong to my second clause ("... widely famed along the path").

I take the subj. of *viśrāvi* to be the Dakṣinā (so also Re): for the patrons the point of all this giving is for it to be noisily celebrated by the poet-recipient. What I would like is for this to be a straightforward main clause: "of them (the Dakṣīnā) is widely famed." But no such luck in *this* hymn. Barring an emendation to **ví śrāvi*, this little clause must also be subordinate. I have adopted the trick used by Ge and Re and made it an unsignaled purpose clause, on no better basis than desperation.

X.94 Pressing Stones

On the supposed authorship of "the snake Arbuda Kādraveya" see Ge's headnote.

X.94.1: Note the four verb forms of √*vad* in the 1st hemistich, with their initial *va*'s reinforced by *vayám* and *vā́cam* (and indeed *[grā́]va[bhyo]*). The addressees of the 2nd pl. *vadatā* in b are presumably the priests (so also Ge), while those of *bháratha* in d are the stones.

On the meaning of *ślóka-* see comm. ad I.51.12.

X.94.2: I take *śatávat sahásravat* as indicating that the (limited number of) stones make as much noise as hundreds and thousands of them -- not that they speak in a hundred or thousand different ways (as it is generally interpr.) or a hundred or thousand separate utterances. The emphasis in this hymn is on how much noise they make.

As Ge points out (n. 2b), they have golden mouths because they are stained with the golden soma.

Note hemistich-final *āsábhiḥ* (b) / *āśata* (d).

Pāda c is almost identical to III.60.3 (Ṛbhus), with *śámībhiḥ* there substituting for our *grā́vāṇaḥ*. Though they are rendered differently in the publ. tr. (III.60.3 [JPB] "... by applying themselves to their labors, ritually acting well by good ritual action"), the divergence seems justified by the lack of agreement on the 2nd word in the pāda.

The Hotar in d is surely Agni (as so often). The point is that even before the oblation is poured into the ritual fire, the stones have tasted it because they are pressing it.

X.94.3–4: The repeated phrase *ávidann anā́ mádhu* (3a, 4b) could also be rendered with an aoristic immediate past "they have found," which would fit with the generally presential context.

The sense and/or function of adverbial *anā́* is difficult to determine. It occurs four times (counting this duplicate phrase only once): here, IV.30.3, VIII.21.13, 47.6. In none of these passages (incl. the phrase here) does "in this way / because of this" fit particularly well (despite the publ. tr. here). In this passage the stones do not find the honey *because* they speak; rather the reverse: their speaking (in both 3 and 4) signals that they have found the honey. I now think that *anā́* means something like 'evidently, clearly', deriving ultimately from 'by this' (=previous action) the actuality of the current action/state can be inferred. I would now alter the tr. to "evidently they have found the honey." That is, we hear them and figure they must have found it. For the other passages see comm. ad locc.

X.94.3: In the sequence *vadanti ávidann* the two verbs have a quasi-palindromic relationship.

In later Vedic, *nyūṅkha-* (and associated denom. forms) refers to a particular alteration in the recitation of the Hotar, whereby an *o* is substituted for the 2nd vowel of each hemistich (see, e.g., Re's Vocabulaire du rituel védique s.v.). This is the only attestation of this lexeme in early Vedic, and it is hard to imagine that the exact later technical sense is meant here (though see G.

Thompson's tr. [unpubl. handout, Leiden Vedic Workshop, 2002] "they chant 'O' over the well-cooked delicacy"). Given the content of the 2nd hemistich as well as the obj. of the verb here ("cooked flesh"), the context seems to involve powerful animals devouring meat. Since later *nyūṅkha-* has to do with sound, our *ny ŭṅkhayante* should express some sort of vocalization appropriate to such a scene. I've chosen 'growl' (like dogs [vel sim.] jealously guarding their piece of meat), but I wish I knew why this oddly formed, very precise technical term was imported into this context. (Perhaps *o* as a mid back vowel sounds most like threatening animal noises from the throat?) Re seems (rightly) not to have taken his own definition of the ritual term into account in *Hymnes spéculatifs*, where he tr. "mordent en grondant" (bite while growling: why use one verb when two will do?); Ge "schlampfen" (slurp), Gr "gierig brummen oder grunzen" (roar or grunt greedily).

It is noteworthy that soma, or rather the soma plant, is conceived of as *cooked* (*pakvá-*) flesh; *pakvá-* can't have its other sense, 'ripe', because *ā́miṣ-* is unambiguously an animal product ('raw flesh'), not a vegetable one. Ch. Malamoud in his *Cuire le monde* (1989) claimed that every Vedic sacrifice involves the offering of cooked food, but he had to make soma a special case, since it is not cooked in any conventional sense. In my review of the 1996 English tr. of this collection (Hist. of Religions 39 [2000]: 384–86), I drew attention to this problem. But as it turns out, at least on the basis of this passage we were both wrong about soma: soma does count as "cooked" to the ritualists themselves, presumably because of the elaborate nature of its preparation. And this makes Malamoud righter about the larger principle than I was willing to allow at the time.

The "branch of the reddish tree" (*vṛkṣásya śā́kham aruṇásya*) must again be the soma stalk, but this time in more natural guise as a member of the vegetable kingdom.

In IX.79.4 the stones gnaw (*bapsati*) the soma, as here. The part. *bápsat-* modifies a dog in VII.55.2, which might support my conjecture that dogs are growling over meat in pāda b. In fact, nothing forbids taking c with b rather than d.

On *sū́bharva-* see EWA s.v. *BHARV*, with lit.

X.94.4: The participles *krósantaḥ* (b) and *āghoṣáyantaḥ* (d) are partial rhymes, and *āghoṣáyantaḥ* picks up *ghóṣam* in 1d.

Note the repetition of *ávidann anā́ mádhu* here. On this phrase and esp. *anā́* see comm. ad vss. 3–4 above, where I suggest an altered tr. for both occurrences of the phrase. Here the shrieking to Indra signals that they have found the honey.

Contrary to standard gr. and tr., I take *saṃrábhyā* not as a gerund but as a gerundive (pausal form *saṃrábhyāḥ*) because of the instr. case of the agent *svásṛbhiḥ*. Although in later Sanskrit gerunds can take instr. agents, the conditions for this are clear: the matrix clause in which the gerund is found is passive (see, e.g., Speyer, Skt. Syn. p. 297, Wh Gr. §994c), and *anartiṣuḥ* "they have danced," though intrans., is not passive. Moreover, it's not clear to me that the instr. agent with a passive matrix clause is found at all in Vedic: a quick look through Delbrück (AIS) and Speijer (Ved. u. sansk. Syn.) didn't turn up any; Wh. (§994c) only provides Classical examples; Macdonell (VGS pp. 332–33) doesn't mention this usage.

X.94.5: The first hemistich compares the stones to two very different animals: the eagle because their noise soars upward; the antelope because of their trampling of the plant on the ground. The root accent of *kŕ̥ṣṇa-* identifies it as the animal (the black antelope) as opposed to the suffixally accented color term *kṛ̥ṣṇá-* 'black'.

Phonetic figure, *n^íyaṅ ní yanti* in c.

On neut. singular *purū́* see comm. ad V.33.4. As I say there, all of the supposed occurrences of this form can be otherwise interpr. (as neut. pls.) – except for this one: it is difficult to find any other function for it here except as a modifier of *rétaḥ*. In this late hymn, the fact that both *-u* and *-ū* can be used for neut. plural may have allowed a nonce spread of *-ū* to the singular, where *-u* is the only regular form. I also wonder if the immed. flg. *r-* had anything to do with it – as if though a degemination and compensatory lengthening of *-ur r-*, though it's hard to see how this would have come about.

In d *sūrya-śvítaḥ* could be either nom.(/acc.) pl. or abl./gen. sg. Both have their advocates: Old favors nom. pl.; Scar (560) allows either; most others (incl. the publ. tr.) prefer the sg., though even there there is disagreement about whether it's gen. or abl. (the latter, acdg. to the publ. tr.). I favor the abl. sg. because the source of the semen should be indicated.

X.94.6: I don't understand the usage of *samā́yamuḥ*. Act. forms of the fairly rare lexeme *sám / ā́ √yam* are otherwise transitive, in the meaning 'hold fast (reins, vel sim.), guide', but this form appears to have no obj. I take it as absolutive or reflexive 'hold (themselves?) fast', despite the act. voice. It's also possible that *dhúraḥ* 'chariot poles' is the obj. not only of part. *bíbhrataḥ* but also of this verb.

X.94.7: Both Ge and Re (Hymnes spec.) refuse to tr. *dáśāvani-*, a failure that seems over-scrupulous. The simplex *avánī-* means 'stream' or 'streambed'; from the latter one can generalize to 'course, track'. Gr renders the cmpd "zehn Bahnen durchlaufend." Although the following four b.v.s with *dáśa-* refer to particular pieces of horse tackle (also *dáśayantra*-in 8a), it would not be surprising for the first in the series to refer to something more general, namely the track that the harnessed stones (/horses) will follow. The "ten" of course refers to the fingers in all instances.

X.94.8: Apropos *ādhā́nam*, for *ā́ √ dhā* used of hitching up horses see VII.34.4.

It's a bit of a challenge to distribute the five gen. sg.s in cd: *sutásya somyásya ándhaso*, *aṃśóḥ ... prathamásya*. I have grouped the three in c and the two in d together, with the latter two dependent on the former three. On the distinction between *ándhas-* and *aṃśú-* see comm. ad IV.1.19. The problem is the "first" – and as Ge points out (n. 8d), it would better if it modified *pīyū́ṣam* 'beestings', i.e., first milk – as in II.13.1 *aṃśóḥ pīyū́ṣam prathamám*; our variant shows a displaced modifier, of the "cold glass of milk" (for *"glass of cold milk") type. It should be "the first beestings of the pressed somyan stalk of the plant."

X.94.9: On my view of √*niṃs* (contra Gotō, etc.) see comm. ad VIII.43.10. Although it might seem odd to assert that the pressing stones "kiss" the two horses of Indra, as Ge points out (n. 9a) Indra's horses are given the soma dregs, the pressed-out soma-plants, as fodder. "Diese fressen also Mund an Mund mit den Steinen" – an appropriate image of kissing.

Ge (n. 9b) calls b a śleṣa: the stones sit on the cow(hide), as milkers sit by a cow.

X.94.10: The *vṛṣāyáte* that ends the previous vs. is picked up by the first word of this vs.: *vṛ́ṣā*, which is predicated of *aṃśúḥ* 'plant'.

There is also a referent shift, which is not entirely clear in the publ. tr. Indra was the 3rd ps. subj. of the previous hemistich (9cd), and we might expect that the "your / you" of vs. 10

refers to Indra, with the very common switch from 3rd to 2nd ps. However, all the 2nd ps. forms in 10 (4 finite verbs, plus enclitic *vaḥ*) are plural and must refer to the pressing stones, which were also in the 3rd ps. in the previous vs. This identification is made clear only in 10d by the voc. *grāvāṇaḥ*.

It's worth noting (though I don't know quite what to do with this observation) the concentration of 2nd pl. act. endings enlarged by *-na*: *riṣāthana* (a), *sthana* (b and c).

I'm not sure why the stones need to be reassured that they won't be harmed. Perhaps the point is that their plant is a powerful bull and can therefore protect them. The similar reassurance in VII.33.4, given to the Vasiṣṭhas, rests on the protective power of Indra.

The problem in the 2nd hemistich is *raivatyéva* — starting with the grammatical identity of the form. Gr sets up a stem *raivatyá-* "Reichtum," to which this would be the neut. pl., an analysis fld by Caland-Henry and Delbrück, acdg. to Old. The only other such vṛddhi form in the RV is masc. *raivatá-* in V.60,4, to which this could, alternatively (and I think correctly), be a fem. *raivatī́-*. Both Ge and Re accept the fem. interpr. (Ge: "die Tochter eines Reichen"; Re [Hymnes spéc] as a plural: "comme les filles du Riche"), but they both seem to take it as a nom., without indicating how they arrive at their grammatical identifications. (Ge's n. 10c on possible irregular sandhi just throws more sand into the gears.) I am fully sympathetic to this tactic, because a nom. works better in context, but feel that I must agree with Old that it is most likely instr. (*raivatyā́*). The masc. vṛddhi form in V.60.4ab throws some light on our passage, in that it establishes a marital wooing context: *varā́ ivéd raivatā́so híraṇyair, abhí ... tanvàḥ pipiśre* "Just like wealthy wooers, with golden (ornaments) they have emblazoned their bodies." The referents are the Maruts, compared to richly ornamented suitors; later in the same vs. (d) they put "marks of greatness" (*máhāṃsi*) on their bodies – cf. our *máhasā*. In V.60.4 the *raivant-* are the wooers come to seek a bride. In our passage the *raivatī́* belongs presumably to the other side of the negotiations: the daughter of a rich man (per Ge, Re) on offer to a suitor or suitors. This casts the pressing stones in the role of the father (/male relatives) of this girl, who pleases the suitor by bestowing his daughter who comes with a rich dowry. The well-pleased suitor is not overtly present in the main clause, but must be supplied as antecedent to *yásya* in d — or such is my interpr. Re (fld. by Don.) takes the referent of *yásya* to be the rich man; Ge seems to take *yásya* as standing for *yád* ("wann") with the gen. expressing an indefinite ("an de Opfer jemandes").

As for the ceremony the stones have enjoyed, this may refer to pāda b, where the stones are well-fed and satiated.

X.94.11: Ge couches the first hemistich in the 3rd ps. ("... sind die Steine"), presumably because of accented *ádrayaḥ*, which cannot be voc; he then switches to 2nd ps. ("... seid ihr") because of 2nd pl. pres. *stha* in c. Re (fld. by Don.) simply uses the 3rd ps. throughout, ignoring the *stha*. Because the stones are insistently addressed in the 2nd ps. throughout the immediately preceding vs. and this 2nd ps. is again overt in our pāda c, I take it all as 2nd ps. I see no problem with a nom. *ádrayaḥ* in a 2nd ps. context.

The pair *tṛdilā́ átṛdilāsaḥ* have been variously interpr. Because the only difference between the two is the privative *á* (and consequent accent shift), I think these refer neutrally to different shaped stones, both of which types are equally good at the work required.

X.94.12: Acdg. to Ge (nn. 12a, 12cd), the first hemistich concerns the (stony) mountains, conceptualized as the fathers of their miniature versions, the pressing stones, while the second half of the verse returns to the pressing stones. The publ. tr. accepts this interpr., but I now think

that pāda c is an ambiguous transition, which can be applied both to the mountains and the stones. The reason for the identification of mountains and stones is pretty clear. The willed immobility of the mountains is implicitly contrasted with the dynamism of the pressing stones. Since we are nearing the end of the hymn, when the stones will be unhitched and return to immobility, the mountains provide a sort of grand model for this state.

As I just said, pāda c seems applicable to both mountains and stones: *ajuryá-* 'unaging, undecaying' in fact fits the mountains better than the stones. Both mountains and stones can be "companions of the golden (soma)" – the mountains because soma famously grows in the mountains, the stones because they press the plant (see their "golden mouths" *háritebhir āsábhiḥ* in 2d).

The next word, *harídrava(ḥ)*, is glossed by Gr "den gelben Rossen nachrennend," but the standard interpr. now (e.g., Old, Ge, Re, Don, Scar [295 and n. 845], EWA s.v. [though with a diff. botanical ident.]) is that this refers to the Haridru tree (Adina cordifolia), a tree with yellow-colored wood and yellow flowers (per internet), much used later in Āyurveda. Why either mountains or stones would be compared to this tree isn't clear to me, but the *hari-* of course carries it a long way.

Pāda d definitely applies to the stones. The use of the redupl. aor. *aśuśravuḥ* 'made listen' with an acc. of the listener and an instr. of the sound reprises the same construction, with different verb *āghoṣáyantaḥ*, in 4b.

X.94.13: The locc. *vimócane yā́man*, adjacent across the pāda boundary, must be contrastive: "on their unhitching and/or on their course." Given that rhetorical structure and given that *añjaspā́(ḥ)* doesn't work well as a simile, I have interpr. *iva* as a sort of hypercorrection for **vā* 'or'. Since *iva* sometimes needs to be read '*va* in late RV (including nearby X.97.10), the poet thinks *vā* can be optionally realized as *iva*. The verbal complex *vā ghă* is fairly common in the RV (I.161.8, 162.8; III.28,2; V.85.8 [=X.139.5]; VIII.12.16, 21.17, 44.23, 47.15; X.61.18), while I find *iva gha* (as *iva ghéd*) only in VIII.43.3. The publ. tr., complete with asterisk, reflects this emendation. I *am* concerned about the location of the phrase, which should be in 2nd position; however, this is a problem also if we read *iva*, since *ghă* is overwhelmingly a 2nd-position (or after *vā*, etc., a modified 2nd-position) particle. (Ge [n. 13b] is also disturbed by the particle placement.)

On *añjas-pā́-* see comm. ad X.92.2. Here the point is that the stones have the first direct contact with the soma; they do not drink an already prepared beverage.

upabdíbhiḥ is repeated from 4d.

The standard tr. effectively take *vápantaḥ* as belonging only to the simile (despite the position of *iva* after *bī́jam*); that is, the simile is "like grain-producers scattering seed." But it seems as if this action should correspond to something performed by the stones as well – in other words, it should express the shared characteristic. I therefore take *bī́jam* as a pun, to be construed with both simile and frame. In the simile it is grain-seed, but in the simile it is (metaphorical) semen. For *bī́ja-* as semen, see, e.g., X.85.37 (the wedding hymn) *yásyām bī́jam manuṣyā́ vápanti* "in whom [=the bride] men scatter their seed." As for the metaphor, see 5d *purū́ réto dadhire* "they [=stones] have themselves produced much semen." That "semen" is of course the liquid pressed out from the plant, but it can be configured as the semen of the stones themselves, which in our vs. is then reinfused into the soma (*pṛ́ñcánti sómam*). This idea is then restated in another image in the post-caesura portion of d: the stones do not make the soma smaller by eating it.

Gr analyzes *dhān^{i}yākṛ́t-* as *dhān^{i}ya-* + *ākṛ́t-*, but this is impossible, since root noun cmpds can have as prior member a nominal or a preverb, but not both. (See disc. in my 2020 "*iṣudhya-*" [Fs. Lamberterie]: 486 with n. 5, and in more detail in my 2024 "Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian" [Fs. Kellens].) Better, with Scar. (74–75), to take *dhānyā-* as a collective pl. or as metrical lengthening in the cadence.

X.94.14: The stones are unhitched and return to their desacralized inanimate state as mere stones. The vs. has several puns that have not been previously recognized.

vā́cam akrata is found also in 5a; nonetheless I tr. them slightly differently, preferring 'speech' in 5 and 'voice' here. (There is of course no difference in the Skt.)

As Re points out (EVP XVI ad loc.), soma is *tunná-* by the pressing stone in IX.67.19–20 – hence the simile here in b.

In c *ví ... muñcā* reprises *vimócane* in 13a.

The pf. part. *suṣuvúṣaḥ* is taken by the standard tr. as gen. sg., referring to the priest who has produced the *manīṣā́m* ('inspired thought'). But it can equally well be acc. pl. m., referring to the stones, and I think both are meant. This double interpr. entails a double interpr. of *ví ... muñcā*: with the stones as obj. it means 'unhitch' (of horses; see, e.g., V.53.7), but with the thought as obj. it means rather 'release (into the world), set free'.

In V.53.7 *vi* √*muc* is followed immed. by *ví* √*vṛt*, as here. In that passage it seems to refer to turning aside from the road to rest, after unhitching. That sense works here as well.

The last pāda has been various interpr., esp. because the sense of *cā́yamānaḥ* is not agreed upon. On this participle, see comm. ad VII.18.8. In our passage I find Ge's interpr. the most compelling: that it is intrans./pass. 'appearing (as), being perceived (as)', indicating that the dynamic protagonists of our hymn are now just seen as inert stones. But I also think *cā́yamānāḥ* is a pun: it could also be interpr. as *ca áyamānāḥ*, that is, with a negated mid. part. to the root aorist of √*yam* (see act. *samā́yamuḥ* in 6a), 'not being harnessed (anymore)'. The *ca* would of course be oddly placed, but I would not be surprised at such a manipulation to enable the pun.

X.95 Purūravas and Urvaśī

On this famous hymn and the later Sanskrit versions of this story, see publ. intro. The general approach to the RVic hymn has been to retroject the narrative found in the Śatapatha Brāh. version onto the RVic hymn, interpreting all enigmatic details in the light of that later version. As I said in the publ. intro., I think the ŚB version misunderstood or deliberately reconfigured the RV one. Similes and other images were taken literally – e.g., the lambs tied to the bedpost in the ŚB were invented out of a <u>simile</u> in vs. 3; there are no real lambs in the RVic hymn. If we approach the RVic version directly, without invoking the ŚB, a very different picture emerges. To readers used to the standard take on this hymn, my interpr. may seem radical and disconcerting. This way of reading the hymn dates back, for me, to an intense exploration of it with Stanley Insler and Joel Brereton sometime in the early 1970s (1973 or 1974?), perhaps the first time that I saw the exhilarating possibilities of close reading of the RV. Some of the ideas in the current tr. and comm. date back to those sessions of 50 years ago and emerged from our joint discussions then.

Needless to say, numerous others have tr. and commented on the hymn, and I cannot consider them all in detail. A recent one is found in Susanne Schnaus's 2008 *Die Dialoglieder im altindischen Rigveda*, 355–404, and Elizabeth Thornton provides a detailed formal and rhetorical

analysis in her 2015 (unpublished) UCLA dissertation "The Double-Voiced Rig Veda: Poetics and Power Dynamics of Formal Structuring Devices."

The pattern of this dialogue is that P speaks and U responds, generally taking up and, indeed, upending his words. Most of the verses are paired, and it is illuminating to read them against each other, but this pattern does not establish itself until vs. 4. In vss. 1–3 P speaks 1 and U responds with 2, but then P completes her vs. with 3. Following this we get

P:	4	U:	5
	6		7
	8		9
	10		11
	12		13
	14		15

The last three vss. break this pattern: the speakers have changed places -- U speaks 16, P 17 – and the two vss. are not responsive. The final vs., 18, seems to be in the mouth of a narrator speaking for the gods.

X.95.1: The first two words of this hymn provide one of the most striking openings of any RVic hymn: *hayé jā́ye* "Woe, wife!" with its in-your-face jingly rhyme (rhyme in general being rare in the RV). On a technical note, it's somewhat surprising that voc. *jā́ye* is accented here in apparent 2nd position. The other RVic occurrence of *hayé* is also followed by a voc. but an unaccented one: II.29.4 *hayé devāḥ*. The disorganized, staccato-like nature of Purūravas's speech, esp. initially (note the parenthetic command inserted after the next word in this pāda), may account for the accent, with voc. "wife!" effectively starting a new, detached utterance.

The function of *mánasā* and its syntactic status are disputed. Some (e.g., Re, Hymnes spéc.) take it as an independent clause, but most construe it with the clause in pāda b, with *tíṣṭha ghore* an interjection. This latter view is more satisfyingly dramatic: having got her attention with *hayé jā́ye*, P starts his plea – but after the first word has to try to arrest her in her flight, with an imperative and another voc. Moreover, I don't see how *mánasā* can be an independent utterance; Re's "sois sage!" is a very loose rendering of the instr. Assuming that *mánasā* belongs with pāda b, what is its function there? With most (Ge, etc.) I take it as a semi-adverb, "with thought, thoughtfully," but Hoffmann (in his complete tr. of and comm. on this hymn, *Injunk*. 198–208) provides parallels for construing it with *miśrā́* (199 n. 179). Again for me the drama is enhanced by having *mánasā* a separate constituent rather than subordinate to a flg. NP (*mánasā … vácāṃsi … miśrā́*).

Note the phonetic figure over the hemistich boundary: *… nú / ná nau*.

Note the pres. subj./impv. *kṛṇavāvahai* (b) contrasting with the aor. subj. *karan* (d) to the same root.

As noted by many, P's use of two deriv. of √*man* 'think', *mánas*- and *mántra*-, situates (or attempts to situate) his approach in the rational, perhaps even coolly logical, realm – an attempt that fails before it even begins.

X.95.2: Urvaśī ignores his gesture towards the rational, but picks up his *vácāṃsi* √*kṛ* (1b), though with an idiom (INSTR. + √*kṛ*) entirely different from his (even though her subj. *kṛṇavā* matches his *kṛṇavāvahai*): *vācā́* √*kṛ* 'do with speech'. Her emphasis is on action—an emphasis reinforced by the next pāda, where she announces her (already accomplished) departure.

By comparing herself to "the foremost of dawns" (*uṣásām agriyā́*), she makes her departure inevitable and irrevocable, since nothing can stop the foreordained journey of each day's dawn. I don't know why the simile particle *iva* is placed after the 2nd word in the simile (though this position is not in fact rare) -- perhaps because the NP *uṣásām agriyā́* is felt to be a unit.

It is worthy of note that she twice uses the (syntactically unnec.) nom. prn. *ahám* with a 1st sg. verb (a: *kṛṇavā ... ahám*, d: *ahám asmi*), presumably emphatically and contrastively, to distinguish and separate herself from P.

X.95.3: By most accounts, this vs. is spoken by P, though Old suggests rather U. In the vs. P nostalgically reminisces about U's untameable and tumultuous beauty. The vs. certainly bears the hallmarks of P's disordered speech, being both metrically and syntactically jagged, and this has given rise to uncertainty of interpretation. In fact, the difficulties of the 2nd hemistich are responsible for the implausible Gandharvas-sheep-and-bedposts of the ŚB version.

There is some disagreement about the position of the pāda break in the first hemistich: either after *iṣudhér*, producing an 8-syl. pāda a and a conventional Triṣṭubh in b; or after *asanā́*, with pāda a 11 syllables, though without a Triṣṭubh cadence, and b 8 syllables. I strongly favor the former: the hemistich trails off U's statement in the preceding vs., 2d, with P adding other similes describing U's fleet beauty. A truncated first pāda calls attention to the fact that it is just finishing a thought already articulated. Moreover, the shared quality of all the similes is U's word (*dur)āpanā́* '(difficult) to attain', the unspoken beginning of P's speech, and it would rhyme with *asanā́* beginning pāda b. Most interpr. construe *asanā́* with pāda a, however (e.g. Ge "Pfeilschuss" somehow combining the two nominatives *íṣuḥ ... asanā́*; KH "ein Geschoss aus dem Köcher," with *iṣudhér asanā́* a separate NP), which would favor a pāda break after *asanā́*. I instead take *asanā́* with the flg. *goṣā́ḥ*, parallel to the next, overt, simile *śatasā́ ná ráṃhiḥ*, supporting the pāda break after *iṣudhéḥ*.

On the phraseology in b, cf. X.178.3 *sahasrasā́ḥ śatasā́ asya ráṃhiḥ* "his charge that wins thousands, that wins hundreds" of the mythical racehorse Tārkṣya. See also *ráṃhi-* in the next hymn, X.96.4.

Against the Pp. and essentially all other tr./comm., I take *śriyá* in sandhi as standing for gen. sg. *śriyás* (a paradigmatic form not certainly found in the RV to this stem, but cf. *dhiyás* to *dhī́-*, as well as possible abl. *śriyás* in IX.94.4 [see comm. ad loc.]). The "quiver of beauty" adds a metaphor to the simile.

I will not engage with the numerous variant interpretations of cd, all heavily influenced (not to say misled) by the ŚB version, but simply attempt to justify my own. In pāda c there are two grammatical issues on which one must take a stand before attempting to interpret the pāda further: 1) does the sandhi form *davidyutan* represent a 3rd sg. in *-at* (so Pp.) before *n-* or a real 3rd pl. in *-an*? 2) is *ná* the negative or the simile particle? I opt for 3rd sg. and simile particle respectively. I take U as the subject of *davidyutat* and interpr. the verb as an irregular subjunctive (for **davidyotat*); cf. the injunc. in 10 *dávidyot*. In fact the occurrence in 10 provides the clue for the interpr. of our pāda here. In 10 P compares U to lightning, with an overt simile: *vidyún ná yā́ ... dávidyot* "She who kept flashing like lightning ..." I think the same simile is covert here, conveyed by the preverb+verb *ví davidyutat*; the noun "lightning," which should be the grammatical focus of the simile, does not have to be expressed because it is embedded in the verb, and so the simile particle dangles rather uselessly right after the verb and at the end of the pāda. Though I have elsewhere (see comm. ad X.21.1 and my 2024 ECIEC paper "Penultimate

ná 'like' in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism," to appear in a forthcoming Fs.) argued that simile-marking *ná* is blocked from pāda-final position, I take its position here, as well as the absence of an overt nominal simile, to be another symptom of P's emotionally distorted speech. The explicit simile in 10b, also applied to U, seems designed to repair the truncated one here.

As to what the pāda is conveying -- P is saying that she is dazzling and that she cannot be mastered ("under no man's will"), with the suggestion that even in her sexual transports she is not subject to male control.

Given the use of *vīra* in 5d, where I tr. 'hero', *avī́re* here might be alternatively tr. 'no hero's'.

Pāda d is also tricky syntactically, with the verb *citayanta* furnishing the trick. As I long ago argued ("Case Disharmony in Ṛgvedic Similes," IIJ 24 [1982] 258–59 with n. 25), *citayanta* here shows two different constructions, one with the simile, one with the frame, both supported by independent occurrences of this stem elsewhere. In the simile the verb is transitive "manifest/display X" (lamb its bleating) with overt acc. obj., while in the frame it is intransitive "be manifest/displayed" ([her] noisy [cries] / tumultuous [tempests]). This image is the third in a series depicting U. as a thunderstorm: the wind (2b), the lightning (3c), and the thunder (3d).

Though this interpr. of vs. 3 is radically at odds with all the standard ones, I think it is rhetorically truer to the rest of the hymn and more powerful emotionally than those that introduce the Gandharvas (unnamed anywhere in this hymn) and pet lambs (extracted from an overt simile).

X.95.4–5: Here P and U present wildly incompatible visions of their previous married life.

X.95.4: In my opinion, in this vs. P. continues his nostalgic reverie, here focusing on U's seamless fit into family life -- until his crude depiction of their sex life in the final pāda. But there are multiple interpr. of all parts of the vs., starting with the identity of the speaker. Both Ge and Re assign the vs. to a narrator, perhaps because U. is described in the 3rd person, even though P. is supposedly conversing with her directly. But his dreamy reversion to a happier time, narrated as if she weren't there in front of him, makes psychological sense. And her sarcastic citation of his final phrase in this vs. (4d) in her response to him in the next (5a) makes it clear that she was the audience for this speech.

The meter of the first three pādas is disturbed and cannot easily be fixed -- nor, given P's disordered state, should it be. With KH, I read *váya(ḥ)* at the end of pāda a, rather than initial in b, because it should be read with the participle *dádhatī*. Moreover, the position of *yádi* in b is better if only one item precedes it in its pāda/clause.

How to construe pāda b and what relation, if any, it has to cd are matters of dispute. The first question involves the word *úṣaḥ*, interpr. by Gr and Ge (apparently also Re, Hymnes spéc., Don) as a nom. sg. m. to a hapax thematic stem *úṣa-* 'lover' (see Ge's n. 4b). By this interpr., U, having been kind to her father-in-law in pāda a, is at the beck and call of her lover, namely P, whenever he wants her (*yádi váṣṭi*) for sex. Even leaving aside the precarious status of the supposed hapax noun *úṣa-*, I find that pāda b works better as a continuation of U's attention to her father-in-law, because of the word *ántigṛha-* 'house opposite' (vel sim.). Although we know nothing about the housing arrangements of the RVic joint family and *ántigṛha-* is a hapax, it still seems more likely that her in-laws would inhabit a separate but nearby dwelling than that she and her husband lived in separate houses and she had to go to his whenever he wanted sex. Instead, I take the subject of *váṣṭi* to be the father-in-law (so also KH, as I read his tr.), whom she dutifully

served (not sexually) whenever he asked her to. (Schnaus takes U to be the subject, on the assumption that U was in fact not a dutiful woman, but did what she pleased. I take the point, but P's musings here focus on his [false] memory of her agreeable subservience.)

What then is *úṣaḥ*? With Old (also KH, Schnaus), an acc. pl. to *uṣás-* 'dawn'. Old himself takes it as a third object to *dádhatī*, "dawns"; that is, U. bestows three boons on her father-in-law – goods, energy, and "dawns," standing for day upon day added to his lifespan. But it's better as a temporal adv.: "mornings, (all) mornings" (so KH, also Schnaus). See AiG III.282 and for the accent III.26.

The subordinator *yádi* should be read *yád *ī* 'when it' rather than 'if'.

The next pāda (c), again in my opinion, contrasts the home (*ástam*) that was U's own with the one opposite (*ántigṛha-*) that belonged to her in-laws. She obtained it and took pleasure in this dwelling of hers, or thus do I interpr. the reference of *yásmin*. Others (Ge, Re, Don) take the referent of the relative to be rather P (e.g., Ge "(zu ihm), an den sie Gefallen hatte"; Don "and took her pleasure in him"). I find it easier to believe that U was house-proud than that even P could delude himself that she was madly eager for his sexual assaults -- esp. given his *avī́re krátau* "under no man's will" in the preceding vs. (3c).

X.95.5: Note the typo in the publ. tr., "used to pierce**d**" ➔ "used to pierce."

As noted above, in pāda a U picks up the final words of the previous vs. (4d), good evidence that P spoke vs. 4 and U was there listening. She now expresses her distaste for his relentless sexual demands in the first hemistich, while, in the second, indicating that she behaved as a dutiful and submissive wife at that time.

The words *kétam* (c) and *vīra* (d) implicitly contrast with the phrase *avī́re krátau* in 3c. Though I tr. both *krátu-* and *kéta-* as 'will' in these two vss., I am playing on the ambiguity of the English word 'will'. In 3c 'will' refers to the power to control: U was under the control of no man. Whereas in this vs. 'will' refers to P's desire, which U went along with – until she didn't. I think she is using the voc. *vīra* ironically; see vs. 11 with vs. 7 below. It would in fact be possible in this sandhi context to read *(me)'vīra* 'o non-hero', but I think the ironic insult is truer to U's rhetoric. Moreover, in pāda b of this same vs. the transmitted *mé 'vyatyai* has to be read with restored initial *á-*; it seems unlikely (though not impossible) that a putative **me 'vīra* would be treated differently.

X.95.6–7: Here P reminisces about the sensuous beauty of U's companions, the Apsarases, while U points out that the Apsarases were not there to delight P's senses but to assist her when she gave birth.

X.95.6: Once again P conjures images from his memory's eye – here of alluring but elusive Apsarases, who, as we learn in the next vs., were attending on the birth of U's child. (I do not follow the view that the Apsarases are currently running away.)

Many tr. (e.g., Ge, Re [HSpéc], Don) take the first hemistich as a list of personal names, but interpreting the words as descriptors of the Apsarases provides a richer semantics.

The vs. is structured by a clever grammatical mismatch: it begins with a rel. prn. *yā́*, which is fem. *singular*, with the collective sg. noun *śréṇiḥ* 'rank, row'; *yā́* is picked up by matching *tā́*, which opens pāda c – but this is *tā́(ḥ)* in sandhi and a fem. *plural*: the implicit plurality of the collective sg. here takes grammatical form. The difference in number is subtly emphasized by rhyming final *caraṇyúḥ* (singular adj.) in b with final *sasruḥ* (pf. plural.) in c.

For *sumnáāpi-* see VIII.13.3 *sumné ... sákhā*. Our form is of course a bahuvrīhi, but I have suppressed the possessive aspect, since 'consisting of friends in good favor' is too clunky.

Most tr. take *añjáyaḥ* as an adjective characterizing the subject, with just *aruṇáyaḥ* in the simile, evoking the dawns – e.g., KH "diese schmucken (?) (Frauen) ... wie die rötlichen (Morgenröten)." This is not impossible, and I admit that the placement of *ná* might favor taking *aruṇáyaḥ* as the first (and only) word in the simile. (However, recall the misplaced *iva* in 2b; indeed simile markers not infrequently appear after the 2nd word of the simile.) But *añjí-* is otherwise only a noun 'salve, ointment' and turning it into an adjective is not trivial. I think (the motion of) the Apsarases is here compared to the fluidity of such semi-liquid substances, which are also appropriate in this context since they could serve as cosmetics for the Apsarases.

The verb *sasruḥ* phonologically evokes *apsarás-*, a word not found in this hymn, though U is an Apsaras and these center vss. (6–9) concern a troop of them.

X.95.7: The depiction of the Apsarases and the rivers assisting at the birth of U's son reminds us of the waters at Indra's birth (IV.18.6–8), though their role there is somewhat equivocal.

Schnaus points out a syntactic problem with this vs.: *asmin* in pāda a, presumably referring to the child of U+P, is unaccented, but the referent is not yet in the discourse, though such an unaccented form should have a prior referent. I don't have an answer for this – but making P. the referent (as the only masc. sg. in the discourse) is too radical, giving grammar more power over sense than even I would favor. The lack of accent may in part signal U's lack of interest in her son (see esp. vs. 13) – making a truly unidentified and unemphatic 'him'. Moreover, in this vs. U seems to adopt some of the careless speech habits of P: her pāda a has an opening of 3; there's the just-mentioned problem with accentless *asmin*; and the segue between pādas b and c is a non sequitur.

With regard to this last, U jumps from the birth of her child and the motherly nurturing of the rivers (*avardhan*, b) to the gods' strengthening of P (*ávardhayan*, d) and their purpose in doing so: for great battle and Dasyu-smiting. Though the same (or almost the same) transitive verb is used for both actions, they otherwise have little in common. Instead, U is preparing to make her case for P.'s generally unheroic behavior and his evasion of his god-destined role, and so she slips this remark in here, pendant to the description of the birth of her son. The use of the son's birth as contrast to P's is found also in vss. 10–11. As for the construction, Ge (n. 7cd) suggests that *yád* is short for **yáthā yád* "just as when ..."

X.95.8–9: In this pair of vss., spoken by P. and U. respectively, she turns his whole vs. against him (see below). Again, he sees the Apsarases as females susceptible to his seductive advances, while she tartly declares their indifference to him. The vs. pairing is signaled by slightly slant repetition: 8a X *yád āsu ...* / 9a *yád āsu*.

X.95.8: On *sácā* as a pleonastic marker of an abl. absolute, see comm. ad IV.31.5. Here as sometimes elsewhere it seems to signal that the action of the loc. absol. is temporally the same as that of the main verb.

The pres. part. *tarásantī* and the impf. *atrasan* belong to the same pres. stem *trásati* to the root √*tras*; the distraction of the initial cluster in the participle is unprecedented. KH (Injunk. 203 n. 185) cleverly – if, in my view, implausibly – suggests that it's the reflex of Sievers-Edgerton Law after a heavy syllable, from underlying *mát *trásantī*, while the cluster remains after the light syllable in *atrasan*. Even if we were inclined still to believe in the Edgerton portion of S-E

Law (distraction of initial clusters after heavy syllable), it seems unlikely to have been preserved only here, in this very late hymn. I suggest instead that it's another symptom of P's lack of control over his speech, here manifesting as stuttering. (That the first simile [the one in c] has a singular, but the frame a plural may be another symptom.)

X.95.9: U uses P's vs. 8 against him, matching him point by point. His *āsu ... ámānuṣīṣu mā́nuṣaḥ* is taken up by her *āsu márto amṛ́tāsu* with a synonym pair; his *ratha-spṛ́ś-* by her *niśpṛ́ś-*; his double similes about animals in the 2nd hemistich matching hers in the same place, with the 2nd simile in both involving horses. In the course of this she turns his point upside down. In vs. 8 he depicts the Apsarases as timid (cd) but potentially eager for his advances (shown by their removing their garments [a]). Her depiction is quite different: her Apsarases may participate in sex with him, even demonstratively ("with their cries" *kṣonī́bhiḥ*), but it is on their own terms. The male is fooling himself if he thinks it was "by his intentions" (*krátubhir ná*); see *avī́re krátau* in 3c indicating the U's sexual life is "under no man's will." The two animal similes in cd show the Apsarases, indifferent to the male, absorbed in preening themselves and playing among themselves – a far cry from the bashful creatures of P's 8cd. Note the reflexive expression *tanvàḥ śumbhata svā́ḥ* (on *śumbhata* see below) and the middle part. *dándaśānāḥ*, both suggesting the Apsarases' focus on themselves and exclusion of the male.

Though belonging to different roots (√*spṛś* and √*pṛc*), *nispṛ́k* at the end of pāda a and *pṛ́ṅkté* at the end of b echo each other, rather like *tarásantī* and *atrasan* in 8ab, even as *nispṛ́ś-* also picks up *ratha-spṛ́ś-* in 8d. For the sensual nuance of *ní* √*spṛś*, see the same root noun cmpd. in nearby X.91.13, where it refers to a wife caressing her husband.

Gr and Ge (fld. by Re [HSpéc], Don) take *śumbhata* as 2nd pl. impv. act. to the common thematized pres. *śumbháti*. However, Old clearly sets out the arguments for taking it as a medial 3rd pl. (athem.) nasal-infix pres. with weak 3rd pl. ending *-ata*, an analysis supported by the existence of the athem. mid. part. *śumbhāná-* (/ *śúmbhāna-*). The early thematization of such a 7th cl. pres. isn't surprising when one contemplates putative forms like 3rd singular mid. **śu-m-b-dhé*, but the 3rd plural keeps the root form reasonably intact. Flg. Old's analysis are KH, Schnaus, and the publ. tr.

X.95.10–11: Like vss. 8–9, these two vss. are paired, with P's speech (10) taken up and twisted by U (11). Here the lexical pivot is √*jan* 'be born'.

X.95.10: Another of P's rosy recollections of U's beauty and sexual compliance. His speech is also marked by metrical disturbance (pāda a) and syntactic disjunction: a relative clause describing U (ab) trails off, to be followed by an unconnected clause about the birth of the child (c) and ending with another clause with U as subject.

As discussed above, pāda a "repairs" the ill-formed simile in 3c, with both passages comparing U to flashing lightning. But it requires some repair of its own: the missing syllable in pāda a could be repaired by the preverb *ví* in tmesis, that is, **ví vidyút ... dávidyot*; cf. 3c *ví davidyutat*. The repeated **ví vi(dyút)* would have undergone haplology – or, perhaps better expressed, the missing syllable gestures towards a preverb that ought to be there but isn't.

In b the adj. *ápyā* is grammatically ambiguous: it can be nom. sg. fem. referring to U or acc. pl. neut. modifying *kā́myāni*. With most (but not Schnaus), I take it as the former. The phrases *ápyā yóṣā* (X.10.4) and *ápyā yóṣaṇā* (X.11.2) support this interpr., as Old points out.

By most interpr., in b P is reminiscing about the joys of love that U brought to him. KH suggests instead that she is taking them away, depriving him of them, as she leaves, but this doesn't fit his nostalgic tone.

The son is born in pāda c. KH notes the etymological figure *jániṣṭaḥ ... súj̄ātaḥ*. The form *apáḥ* is one of the few exx. of a singular form, in this case ablative, of *áp-* 'water'. This source of his birth identifies him with his mother, who was just called *ápyā* in b, as well as with the birth as depicted in 7ab, with the participation of the rivers. In my view *náryaḥ* 'belonging to men' connects him with his father, the human P – though this argument is weakened by the fact that *nárya-* can be applied to gods as well as humans.

The standard interpr. of d is that it is U's life that is lengthened (e.g., Ge "Urvaśī soll langes Leben haben"), with the only disagreement being about the modality of the injunctive (*prá*) ... *tirata*. But as an Apsaras, U is surely immortal – note they are called *amṛ́ta-* in 9a -- and so it makes little sense that she would lengthen her own lifetime. Instead I think the life in question is the son's and that this is a pun. The name of U's (and P's) son is Āyu; see, e.g., IV.2.18, V.41.19, and Macd. Ved. Myth 135 n. 9. The obj. phrase *dīrghám ā́yuḥ* "long lifetime" in d therefore plays off his name. Since the son has a mortal father, he is limited to a mortal lifespan, but his mother does what she can to make it a long one. (Of the comm. and tr. I've consulted, only Don interprets it this way: "Let Urvaśī lengthen the span of his life.")

It is striking that this is the first occurrence of the name Urvaśī in this hymn, found also in vs. 17. By contrast, U addresses P in the vocative in vss. 2, 5, 7, 11, 15, that is, in most of the vss. she speaks (but not 9, 13, or 16).

X.95.11: U matches P's *jániṣṭa* (10c) with *jajñiṣé* (11a), both pāda-initial, but she's pivoting to P's own birth: the purpose for which he was born and his failure to fulfill that purpose – a more explicit follow-up to 7cd. Though as king and warrior he was born to provide protection to his kingdom and subjects, instead he has exerted his force (*ójas-*) only on her.

I do not entirely understand the function or position of *hí* in 11a, but I assume that it is meant to mark the preceding purpose dative *gopī́thyāya* as a separate small clause, much like purpose datives in Brāhmaṇa prose.

It is not made clear in c on what precise day (*sásmin áhan*) she issued her warning, but the general view (e.g., Ge n. 11c) that it was the day they first came together seems reasonable.

X.95.12–13: Another pair of vss., this time devoted to the fate of the child. P (12) tries to play the family harmony card, but U (13) shows herself quite willing to abandon the child to his father.

X.95.12: As just noted, P tries to persuade her to return on the basis of family ties, three generations of them: the sorrow of a single-parent child (ab), the indissoluble bond between the joint 'masters of the house' (*dámpatī*) (c), and the parents-in-law (d). The in-law relation thus returns from 4ab. Although *śváśureṣu* is plural here, it presumably only names the parents of the husband, with the plural appropriate to a general statement about the relationships in a joint family.

In b the identity of *cakrán* has long been disputed (see Old, Ge n. 12b), though has generally been assigned to √*krand* 'roar, cry out'. However, KH's ingenious interpr. of *cakrán ná* as *cakráṃ ná* "like a wheel" (already MSS 8, 1956, but repeated in Injunk. 205 n. 190 and repr. in Aufs. II) has won general acceptance (e.g., Re HSpec, Schnaus, publ. tr.).]

Most interpr. assume the child is crying because he (now) knows he's separated from his father, but why would this recognition (*vijānán*) come to the child only now. I think it's instead possible that these are tears of joy at seeing his father (again). Although I recognize that this doesn't seem to work well with 13a, I think P is imagining a sentimental little scenario of tender reconciliation, which U then cruelly twists in the next vs.

X.95.13: U's curt dismissal of the child and his feelings (or the feelings invented for him by P) is shockingly harsh.

The sequence *vartáyate áśru, cakrán ná* almost replicates, in mirror image, 12b *cakrán ná áśru vartayat*, though split across the pāda boundary. But, though it thus begs to be interpr. as a unit, this is not possible because of the unaccented *krandat* that immediately follows: *cakrán ná* must be part of the *krandat* clause, while it is very difficult to fit *vartáyate áśru* into the same clause. KH's solution seems the correct one. The wheel is no longer the comparandum for the tear (sharing roundness), but for the child, who screeches like an unoiled wheel – as in the English saying "the squeaky wheel gets the grease." U has transferred the simile from one target to another, and the picture is distinctly less attractive: a noisy crybaby, not a sad child silently releasing a single tear.

Her distaste for her child comes through even more strongly in c, where she refers to him with neuter pronouns (*tát ... yát*). Although Ge (n. 13c) suggests that the neuter refers to everything U still has from P, including the child, such an interpr. dilutes the power of her statement – and seems a modern version of the later Indian attempts to soften U into a more conventional female.

In d she tries to wrap up their conversation ring-compositionally, echoing phrases from the vs. containing her first speech: *párehi ástam* repeats 2c (*púnar) ástam párehi* and *nahí ... mā́paḥ* "you will not attain me" is more or less equivalent to 2d *durāpanā́ ... ahám asmi* "I am hard to attain." But P ignores the closure generated by the rhetorical structure. For a similar attempt to close a dialogue ring-compositionally, see Yama's words in X.10.2 and 12, which more successfully put an effective end to the conversation.

X.95.14–15: The last pair of responsive vss.: P's over-the-top self-dramatizing (14) is met by U's weary pacifying.

X.95.14: P responds with maudlin, self-pitying threats to do himself in. All three verbs in this vs., *prapátet*, *śáyīta*, and *adyúḥ*, all in the optative, are accented, though there's no overt mark of subordination. Old (ZDMG 60: 735 = KlSch 210; fld by KH and Schnaus) suggests the accent is emphatic, but this is not terribly satisfactory. (Everything P says is emphatic.) I suggest they are unsignaled "what if" clauses. The publ. tr. represents this for *prapátet*, but in the 2nd hemistich the verbs should rather be tr. "(Of) if he should lie ... or if the wolves should eat ..." This interpr. essentially follows Re's tr. (HSpec, fld. also by Don), though he doesn't discuss the accent. The implied main clause in all instances is "wouldn't you be sorry?!"

X.95.15: U's first hemistich echoes P's three clauses, but in *mā́* prohibitives with expected adjustment of aspect stem and/or root: her redupl. aor. *prá paptaḥ* picks up his pres. *prapátet*; her aor. *akṣan* (√*ghas*) his pres. *adyuḥ* (√*ad*, which lacks an aor.). Her *mṛthāḥ* "(don't) die" paraphrases his more elaborate *śáyīta nírṛteḥ upásthe* "should lie in the lap of Dissolution" – and of course an aor. to √*śi* barely exists at this period.

Her deprecatory remark about women in the 2nd hemistich seems to me not the result of self-hating misogyny on her part but rather an attempt to deflect him into the general: all women are bad — so stop ranting at me.

X.95.16: This remark of U's seems like a non sequitur (see Old's similar puzzlement). It is also difficult for those with even a passing familiarity with Greek mythology to avoid interference from the Persephone story. But it *should* be avoided: this verse is surely not indicating that U, having consumed some mortal food, is now stuck living at least part of the time with mortals, but the reverse – that she's tasted quite enough mortal food, however tiny the portions, and she's taking off. As KH says, the verse provides the reason "warum Urvaśī persönlich vom irdischen Leben 'genug hat'." Unfortunately the reason is expressed obliquely. Don suggests that butter (i.e., ghee) may stand in for semen, and U is saying that she's had more than enough sex with P. A clever suggestion, but somehow it doesn't ring true to me.

Pādas a and b can form one subordinate clause, or b can be a main clause, since the accented verb *ávasam* opens the pāda. With most others, I favor the first option.

I take the 1st ps. sg. forms *acaram* (a) and *carāmi* (d) as functionally contrastive: *acaram* has full lexical sense ("I roam") and *carāmi* is an auxiliary with *tātṛpāṇā́* "I continue to be sated." Most interpr. treat the two thus (see, e.g., Ge n. 16d), but not Kü (216–17: "... wandle ich hier befriedigt") or probably Schnaus ("... lebe ich hier als Gesättigte").

X.95.17: P makes one last-ditch effort to persuade her, but she has already departed – as the impv. *ní vartasva* "turn back" (d) shows. This abrupt imperative sketches a conceptual ring with the likewise abrupt *tíṣṭha* "stand still" that he addressed to her in the first pāda of the hymn.

The high-style descriptors of U in pāda a, "she who fills the midspace, who is the measurer of the dusky realm," may suggest that she is literally, before his eyes, traversing the midspace on her way to heaven (so approx. Ge n. 17). In V.41.19 U is described as *bṛhaddivā́* 'of lofty heaven', so her ordinary dwelling may be there.

On *úpa śikṣa-* with acc. complement see comm. ad I.112.19, 173.10.

P's characterization of himself as *vásiṣṭhaḥ* is puzzling, esp. since the generic superlative sense is vanishingly rare, as against the PN of the poet of Maṇḍala VII; once again Old is similarly puzzled. In VII.33.11 it is said that Vasiṣṭha Maitrāvaruṇa was "born from Urvaśī" or "born from the mind of U" (*urváśyāḥ ... mánasó 'dhi jātáḥ* (cf. also VII.33.13 *apsarásaḥ pári jajñe vásiṣṭhaḥ*). But P is hardly representing himself as U's son, and the possibility (which Old entertains) that we are now dealing with that Vasiṣṭha rather than P as speaker is strongly countered by P's usual tone of desperate longing (esp. pāda d). I have no answer.

The verb in c, (*úpa ...*) *tíṣṭhāt*, is accented, with no sign of subordination. As in vs. 14 I think the accent indicates that this is is an unmarked subordinate clause, in this case giving the grounds for the action he hopes she will perform: doing a good deed — that is, returning to him — will bring her a reward.

X.95.18: The dialogue is at an end, and the last vs. seems to be spoken by the poet or by a disembodied heavenly voice – at least acdg. to most interpr: KH puts it in the mouth of U (as she flies up through the midspace?). In any case, whoever the speaker is, there is another layer of quotation, since the speaker ventriloquizes what the gods said to P.

The syntax and sense of b are unclear. The most straightforward way to take it is with *bhávasi* as the verb in the *yáthā* clause (so Old, Ge, Re, Don). But the sense is not entirely

satisfactory, since it takes P's bond with death as a given, not the result of some (recent) action – as the change-of-state verb *bhávasi* implies. I therefore follow KH's more complex split into two clauses, with *bhávasi* starting the main clause and owing its accent to its position. (Acdg. to Old, this is the interpr. in Ge's Komm., which he abandoned in the tr.) The point is that though P has a divine (/semidivine?) mother, Iḍā (hence the voc. in pāda a, *aiḷa*), he remains bound to mortality because U did not snatch him up and make him immortal (unlike Tithonus, made immortal by Eos in Greek mythology). Nor did she make their child immortal, so he will sacrifice to the gods (c), rather than himself receiving sacrifice.

But it seems that, nonetheless, P may receive special treatment after death, in heaven (*svargé*, d). It is difficult to interpr. this last statement, however. For one thing, this is the only occurrence of the word *svargá-* in the RV. For another, the root √*mad* is used of the exhilaration enjoyed by the Pitars (/forefathers) after death in the funeral hymn X.14 (see esp. vs. 10, where it is clear that the subject of *mádanti* is the Pitars) – and so the verb in d, *mādayāse*, which declares to P that he will reach exhilaration in heaven, may not be promising more than the usual postmortem joys that all humans receive.

X.96 Indra's horses

On the extended puns in this hymn, see publ. intro. Almost every pāda contains a form of *hári-/ hárita-* or *hárya-*, sometimes more than one. Outside of vs. 13, the final summary vs., only 6a and 12c lack such forms.

X.96.1: The lexeme *prá ... śaṃsiṣam* here substitutes √*śaṃs* in the more standard formula *prá vocam*. The lexeme *prá* √*śaṃs* evokes the term *práśasti-*, the proclamation of praise appropriate for a human (usually king), so perhaps the fact that the object is horses (however divine), rather than a god, conditioned the choice of verb.

Although *prá* is rare with √*van*, I do not think, *pace* Re, that it is found here only to match the *prá* beginning pāda a. Cf. the inf. *právantave* in I.131.5.

The tr. of the subject of pāda c should be emended to "the delightful (drink) ..." As for the verb, Wh (Rts) registers one occurrence of a 1st class pres. *sécate*, namely this one. It should probably be interpr. instead as the subjunctive to the root aor. marginally found in the Br and tr. "will drip" here. However, note that Gotō (327) argues for its identity as a 1st class indic. present.

X.96.2: The syntax of this vs. is surprisingly clotted, and there are several possible ways to interpr. the overall structure. I take the two hemistichs as syntactically separate; in the first hemistich, pāda a is a preposed rel. cl. and pāda b is the main cl., with the pres. part. *hinvántaḥ* functioning as main verb, whose subject is the same as the *yé* of a. This rel. cl. / main cl. structure begins with an acc. phrase *hárim ... yónim* "the golden womb," presumably referring to the soma cup (vel sim.). It functions as the goal for both verbs in this complex: *abhí ... samásvaran* "they have cried out together towards" and *hinvántaḥ* "spurring [horses]" towards" and should be taken as fronted around the whole structure, not merely from the rel. cl. The acc. simile ending b, *divyáṃ yáthā sádaḥ* "like a heavenly seat," is to be matched with the golden womb opening the hemistich; it can be read with both a and b or only with b. The polarization of these two heavy acc. phrases accounts for much of the apparent awkwardness of the phrasing.

The subjects are presumably the priestly officiants.

The second hemistich also consists of a rel. cl. followed by a main cl., whose structure is more pellucid than ab. Indra is the referent of the rel. *yám* in c and is named in the main cl. of d. In the simile in c, *háribhir ná dhenávaḥ*, *háribhiḥ* is the shared property: the priests fill Indra with golden soma as the cows do with golden ghee. The only slight syntactic problem in the hemistich is that the verb of the rel. cl. is 3rd pl. *pṛṇánti* while that in the main cl. is 2nd pl. *arcata*. We can either assume that the impv. *arcata* is addressed to a different set of officiants than those in abc, or that a switch to direct address has happened in midsentence, which would not be unusual.

The use of the adj. *hárivantam* in d to modify the fortifying hymn (*śūṣám*) is cute: this stem, usually in voc. *harivas*, is of course almost entirely used of Indra "accompanied by his fallow bays." Here, though Indra is explicitly present in the pāda, it does not modify him but rather the hymn, and *hári-* refers not to his horses but to the soma. See vs. 8 below for another ex.

X.96.3: It is quite possible that the *vájra* is the only referent of the two forms of *háriḥ* in b. The mace is described as *níkāma-* in VI.17.10, and the location of the *vájra* in Indra's two fists is widespread (I.130.4, VI.45.18, VIII.12.7; cf. with sg. fist VI.20.9, X.44.2). However, there is no reason why soma should not be eager for Indra, and the fists are associated with the pressing and purification of soma (e.g., IX.71.3 and a number of repetitions of *mṛjyámāna- gábhastyoḥ* (IX.20.6, etc.).

hári-manyu-sāyaka- is one of the very few multimember compounds in the RV. (I count no more than 15 exx.) It has received a surprising number of alternative translations. Gr takes it as 'dessen Zorneswaffe [=*manyusāyaka*] (Blitz) goldfarben ist', with Zorneswaffe standing for *vájra*. Ge, flg. Sāy. (n. 3c), sees the 2nd and 3rd members as a dvandva, with both equated with *hári-*, standing for soma: "sein Ingrimm [=*manyu*] und sein Geschoss [=*sāyaka*] ist der goldgelbe (Soma)." Re appositely cites the voc. phrase in the Battle Fury hymn X.83.1 *manyo ... vajra sāyaka* and on this basis seems to consider the middle member *manyu* to be predicated of both the 1st and the 3rd members: "qui a pour arme-de-jet la Fureur, pour (foudre [*vájra*]) doré (la Fureur)." But this would be an oddly constructed compound indeed. My interpr. differs from all three, though is perhaps closest to Gr's: I consider *manyu-sāyaka-* a determinative cmpd with *manyu-* in genitival relationship with *sāyaka-*; this cmpd in turn is equated with *hári-*, which stands for both *vájra-* and soma, which are, of course, both necessary for Indra's successful fighting.

X.96.4: The mace undergoes a series of metaphorical transformations in this vs. – from the static sun (a), to a racehorse (b), to Indra himself (c), before becoming a weapon again (d). The first three pādas also trace the trajectory of the mace's use in the Vṛtra battle. It is first put in Indra's hand; Indra then swings it energetically and (likely) in a wide arc; it then hits the serpent.

As Ge points out, the beacon placed in heaven must be the sun; this is a disguised instantiation of the formula "place the sun" that I discussed in the Melchert Fs. ("Sū́re Duhitár's Brother, the 'Placer of the Sun'," 2010). The location where the mace has been set in place is not specified, but it is either Indra's fist (as in 3b) or, less likely, Indra himself (3d).

In b the mace seems to be compared to a racehorse "with its charge" (*ráṃhyā*); see the "charge" in the preceding hymn X.95.3 as well as that of the mythical racehorse Tārkṣya in X.178.3 *sahasrasā́ḥ śatasā́ asya ráṃhiḥ* "his charge that wins thousands, that wins hundreds." As noted just above, I think this pāda depicts Indra's energetic swinging of the *vájra*. This

movement would be the *vájra*'s "charge." The verb in the pāda, *vivyácat*, is ambig. in both form and function. The publ. tr. follows Kü's (505) interpr. as a perfect subjunctive, but given the injunctives in the neighboring pādas (*dhāyi* a, *tudát* c), I might be inclined towards Old's interpr. as thematic pluperfect (injunctive). As for meaning, √*vyac* ordinarily means 'contain, envelop, encompass', with object. But given *vyácas-* 'expanse', the nuance seems to be that the space that is encompassed is extensive. Here without object the idea seems to be that the racehorse gobbles up the distance of the course it runs on, and so encompasses it. In the same way the *vájra* encompasses the space that it swings through.

The poet plays tricks with reference in pāda c, which harks back to two different phrases in the preceding vs., which point to two different referents. The first we encounter is *háriśipraḥ* 'golden-lipped', which echoes *suśipráḥ* in 3c, referring to Indra. But the next phrase, *yá āyasáḥ* "which is made of metal," found in 3a, seems to swing the interpr. definitively to the mace (but see 8a below). Why/how is the mace golden-lipped? It may simply mean that it is golden, as has been repeatedly emphasized. Or perhaps it is now closely identified with Indra, whose lips are dripping with soma. In any case the *vájra* has agency here, as the one who thrusts/pushes the serpent, in effect *vṛtra-hán-*.

In d *harimbhará-* must be Indra, so that the *vájra* (identified as *hari-*) has been demoted to a material object again. I do not understand why Indra becomes 'thousand-flamed' under these circumstances.

X.96.4–5: Note that initial *tudád* is echoed by *tuvaṃ(-tuvam*) opening 5a and c.

X.96.6: The stem *mandín-* ordinarily modifies soma and means 'exhilarating', and I have followed that path here, though a passive 'exhilarated' of course fits Indra better.

X.96.7: As in vs. 2, *hárivant-* modifies not its usual referent, Indra, but, here, *kā́ma-* 'desire'.

X.96.8: The poet returns to the conundrum of vss. 3–4. In 4c we were whiplashed by the incompatible phraseology, which first suggested that Indra was the referent, but then seemed to decisively identify the *vájra* because of the izafe-type rel. *yá āyasáḥ* "which is made of metal." But here the referent can hardly be anyone but Indra: all the rest of the phraseology in the vs. points to him. But he is called *āyasáḥ*. Is this simply a metaphorical application of this adj. to mean especially strong and invulnerable, like the superhero Iron Man? or is Indra now identified with his mace, as his mace is transformed into him? If so, it's a mace that can drink (see b).

X.96.9: As Ge suggests (n. 9b) *vā́jāya* is probably an abbreviation for *vājapéyāya-* 'drink of victory' vel sim. Although the cmpd is not attested until the AV and already there is the name of a particular ritual (parallel to the Rājāsūya, Aśvamedha, etc. [e.g., AVŚ XI.7.7]) not a drink, the ritual must have been named after a ritual drink, and in our passage *turaspéya-* 'drink of overcoming' (?) in the preceding vs. (8b) would have conjured it up. I offer an alternative tr. "sets his two lips to twitching for (the drink) of victory." The vs. is stuffed with reff. to drinking.

With Ge (also Kü 294) I take *dávidhvataḥ* as the gen. sg. of the intens. part. agreeing with *yásya* in pāda a, *pace* Sāy., Gr, who take it as 3rd du. Schaf. identifies it as a 3rd du., but then says *śípre* is its <u>object</u>, which sounds like the Ge interpr., since there are no other duals that could serve as subj.

X.96.10: “Both dwelling places” are presumably Heaven and Earth; see *ródasī* in 11a.

The epithet *hárivant-* now finally has its proper referent, Indra (see above vss. 2 and 7).

X.96.11: With Ge, I supply ‘fill(ed)’ with *ā́* in pāda a, on the basis of the stereotyped expression “fill the two worlds with greatness.” Cf., e.g., III.54.15 *ubhé ā́ paprau ródasī mahitvā́* (repeated twice elsewhere).

X.96.12: On *prayúj-* see comm. ad X.33.1. I would now change the awkward “advance teams of the peoples” just to “teams of the peoples.”

Contra Pp (and Lub), the sandhi form *píbā* must be an underlying subjunctive *píbās* in the *yáthā* purpose clause, not an impv. *píba*. So Old.

On the problematic *dáśoni-* see comm. ad VI.20.4. Here it is supposed to refer to the “10-armed sacrifice,” i.e., one conducted by 5 priests.

X.96.13: The second hemistich of this summary vs. is found elsewhere (cd = X.116.4; d also = I.104.9). As pointed out above, the key words of this hymn are almost lacking in this vs. (save for *harivaḥ* in pāda a), a sign that it is extra-hymnic.

X.97 Plants

As Ge points out, the hymn is entirely Atharvan in character. It corresponds roughly to AVŚ VIII.7 and AVP XVI.12–14, with very different orders and selections of vss., as well as various YV versions. The variety and lack of overlap gives a free and somewhat improvisational feel to the healing herbs verses.

X.97.1–2: In 2ab *dhā́māni* contrasts with *rúhaḥ*, which I render ‘shoots’, and it is therefore tempting to tr. it as ‘roots’ – the emplaced part of the plant, the foundation – or the body or stem of the plant, but that works less well in 1d. In 2ab Ge (n. 2b) suggests rather than the *rúhaḥ* are the individual plants and the *dhā́māni* their types (/species) (Arten); the difference in numbers (100 versus 1000) could support his view.

X.97.2: The adj. *agadá-* appears twice in the RV (here and X.16.6); it is probably also related to *vigadá-* in X.116.5 (q.v.). It is usually etymologically connected with √*gad* ‘say’, whose verb forms are first attested considerably later. (Note also that the root violates IE root-structure constraints, beginning and ending with a plain voiced stop.) The chronological gap in attestation is not as troubling as it might be, given that the RVic occurrences of *-gadá-* are in the Xth Maṇḍala in non-hieratic contexts. The sense ascribed to it here – ‘without disease’ – (as well as Cl Skt. *gada-* ‘disease’) is explained by Th as a dev. from *‘curse, spell’. See EWA s.v. *GAD* for disc. The speech component of the underlying root may be found in the other occurrence of *agadá-* as well as *vigadá-*.

X.97.4: This vs. is structurally complex, in that its first hemistich contains fem. pl. vocatives (*mātaraḥ ... devīḥ*) and a 2nd pl. enclitic prn. (*vaḥ*) and its second a masc. sg. voc. *pūruṣa* and a 2nd sg. prn. (*táva*). The second half must be the direct speech of the poet-healer, signaled by pāda b *tád ... úpa bruve* “I say this to you / I implore you in this way” and probably also by the *íti* in pāda a, though that also marks *óṣadhīḥ* as a quoted name. The speech in cd seems to be addressed by the poet-healer to his sick client. As Ge cleverly suggests (n. 4c), the three acc. in c

áśvaṃ gā́ṃ vā́saḥ indicate what the healer hopes to get for his fee, while *ātmā́naṃ táva* refers to the self of the person being healed. (That d is repeated in 8d in a different context supports the notion that it can be separately interpreted here.) The sense might be clearer if it were rendered "Might I gain a horse, a cow, a garment – and for you your very self, o man."

X.97.5: One might ask what earthly good getting a cow would do for the plants, but (more or less with Old) the idea must be that the plants are the poet-healer's helpers and will technically have a share in the cow he hopes to get for himself (4c).

X.97.6: Again the aid of the plants makes the poet successful at healing: poet + plants ➔ healer.

X.97.7: I take the acc. sgs. in ab to be plant names (see Ge n. 7ab), an interpr. supported by 9ab.

X.97.8: As in 5c, in pāda c here the poet uses the conceit that the plants desire a material fee for healing the client. Again as in 5, the difference between the two objects of √*san* would be clearer with the tr. "... as they seek to gain the stake -- and for you your very self, o man."

X.97.9: The stem *sīrā́-* in most of its RVic occurrences (I.174.9, etc.; see EWA s.v.) appears with a form of √*sru* 'flow' and seems to mean 'stream', a sense acknowledged by Mayr (EWA), though he finds the word "problematisch." Ge (n. 9c) thinks that meaning is excluded here, but he does not sufficiently explore the metaphorical possibilities. The phrase *sīrā́ḥ patatríṇīḥ*, lit. "winged stream(bed)s" describes plants; the wings can be leaves, while the stream(bed) can be the stem/stalk, a hollow tubelike shape with liquid (sap) running through it like a streambed

The primary 2nd pl. ending *-tha* of (*níṣ*) *kṛtha* is surprising, since the verb must belong to the root aorist stem. KH (Injunk. 111, 166) plausibly explains this (and similar formations) as an attempt to make clear that the form is being used as an injunctive, not an imperative, as the imperatival use of morphologically ambiguous forms like *kṛta* is the prevailing one. This explanation seems generally correct for this little clutch of forms. However, I think something further is involved in our passage, esp. since *níṣ kṛtha* seems to be not preterital but presential, given that it is the main cl. verb to the present *āmáyati* in the dep. cl. We might expect *níṣ kṛṇutha* (or **kurutha* with the newer 5th class present) with a present stem, but to produce the rhyme form to *níṣkṛtīḥ*, which ends the first hemistich, the root aor. stem had to be used. It's at this point that KH's argument kicks in – the propoer injunc. **kṛta* would have been liable to interpr. as an impv.

X.97.10: I don't understand the image of ab: what are the plants actually doing? Are they growing riotously over the fence (in their garden, as it were), or are they breaching the body's envelope to heal from within? I favor the latter; I find it hard to imagine Rigvedic settlements as having fenced-in gardens.

X.97.11: Ge takes *vājáyan* as the denom. "nach dem Siegerpreis (Gewinn) verlangend," but it's best to take it to the other stem *vājáya-*, inherited transitive 'invigorate, incite'; see my *-áya-* book (89); so Re as well as Forssman 1987.

The real puzzle in the vs. is pāda d, esp. the rt. noun cmpd *jīva-gṛ́bh-*. Scar (113–14) discusses the phrase at length, following Forssman's 1987 (Fs. Rau) treatment. Forssman interpr. *purā́* as "temporal-präventive" ("zum Schutze vor, zur Vermeidung von") and the cmpd as an

abstract (since only abstracts are construed with *purā́* in that sense). The point here seems to be that the mere act of the healer's picking up the healing plants causes the sickness to die, so as to avoid being "captured alive" – that is, having the remedy directly applied to it. I would now alter the tr. to "as if against [=to prevent] being captured alive." I think we can safely dismiss Macdonell-Keith's (Vedic Index, s.v.) reproduction of Roth's view that it refers to a police officer in the RV.

X.97.12: The voc. *oṣadhīḥ* was omitted from the tr. Alter to "O plants, him ..."

A different rt. noun cmpd. causes trouble here, *madhyama-śī́-*, lit. 'lying in the middle'. Given the context, it refers to someone who is powerful (*ugráḥ*) and successfully drives away enemies like illnesses. The word is discussed at some length by Ge, Old, and Scar (535), as well as Macdonell-Keith (Vedic Index, s.v.), Whitney (ad AVŚ IV.9.4), and Jeong-Su Kim (2014, ad AVP IX.8.9 [p. 276]). It seems to refer to a king, or similar figure, whose position in the center gives him particular power or authority – perhaps the positional version of "primus inter pares." It seems quite unlikely to be, *pace* Old, a person in the middle of a bed, who pushes his companions to the right and the left edges of the bed. The sense might be clearer as "situated in the middle," rather than "lying ..."

X.97.13: *nihā́kā-* is another puzzling word. Re (Fs. Turner, cited EWA s.v.) interpr. it as 'blizzard', hence a derivative of √*snih*, the IE 'snow' word.

X.97.14: The unidentified fem. pl. referents are of course the plants, again as helpers of the poet-healer.

X.97.18: Although the publ. tr. does not make this clear, the "you" of c is sg. and fem. It presumably refers to the particular medical plant singled out in 19d and 21d.

X.97.22: The *pārayāmasi* in d should be considered beside *pārayiṣṇvàḥ* in 3d. In both cases the verb means "deliver (to the far shore) / deliver (from evil/illness)."

X.98 Rain

On the structure and backstory of this hymn, see publ. intro., as well as the extensive intros of Old and Ge, and HPS's lengthy treatment (B+I 89–92). The hymn provides a basis for an elaborate itihāsa (Nir. 2.10, BṛhDev. 7.155ff.), which, however, does not seem to be reflected in the RVic hymn.

X.98.1: This vs. has received a wide variety of interpr., depending in great part on the interpr's notion of the nature of Bṛhaspati. Ge (n. 1a), for ex., takes Bṛhaspati as a protean god, able to take form as any of the gods mentioned. However, as HPS points out, there is no parallel for this. Moreover, in the RV *práti* √*i* does not mean 'take form as' (vel sim.), but 'go up against, confront'. (For other interpr. of the vs., see esp. HPS's disc. pp. 90–91.) My interpr. rests on an alternative suggested by Ge (also n. 1a), that bcd are the direct speech of Bṛhaspati to the gods in question, seeking one who can exert influence on Parjanya.

The impv. *vṛṣāya* is somewhat problematic. It must be trans./caus. 'make rain'; see Sāy.'s gloss *varṣaya* – in which case, why not just use that causative stem (*varṣáya-*)? The obvious answer is meter: *varṣaya* would not fit the cadence – though meter is never an entirely

satisfactory answer. Two homonymous verb stems are joined in *vṛṣāyá-*: the more common is the denom. 'act the bull', always middle; the less common one found twice in the middle (IX.71.3, X.44.4), with the intrans. meaning 'rain'. In both these passages there is also a likely pun on 'act the bull' (for disc. see comm. ad locc). The sole act. form is here, and it has developed a contrastive trans./caus. value. It is possible that there's a buried pun on the 'bull' sense, but I don't see any positive evidence for this.

X.98.2: The god Agni, one of the only prominent gods not mentioned in vs. 1, appears here—having apparently taken Devāpi's message in vs. 1 (delivered in front of the ritual fire?) to Bṛhaspati. Rather than serving as Devāpi's intermediary with the other gods, Bṛhaspati offers to place effective speech in Devāpi's mouth, presumably so he can approach the gods directly.

Note the insistent *pratīcīnáḥ práti* (... *vavṛtsva*) in c, picking up *práti* (... *ihi*) in 1a.

X.98.3: Devāpi happily accepts Bṛhaspati's offer, as is seen in his near word-for-word repetition in pāda a of B's speech in 2d.

On metrically bad *iṣirā́m* see comm. ad X.68.3.

Pāda d plays on multiple senses of *drapsá-* 'drop'. Ge and HPS think the primary referent here is 'soma'; however, although both *drapsá-* and *mádhumant-* are commonly used of soma in Maṇḍala IX, I think this referent is a distant third here. Since Bṛhaspati has just offered to put speech in Devāpi's mouth and Devāpi has accepted, I think it likely that the honeyed *drapsá-* is this very speech, which Devāpi is consuming by mouth. And it is hard not to see a reference to rain in a word 'drop' (as pointed out by many).

X.98.4: There is disagreement about the speaker of this vs.: Ge opts for Bṛhaspati, while Old (hymn intro.) prefers Śaṃtanu. Although Bṛhaspati would make the four-vs. sequence more symmetrical, and 4a answers 3d, as 3a did 2d, I find it unlikely that Bṛhaspati would have to say "*let* the drops enter...," since, as a god, he presumably has some control. Moreover, the orders given to Devāpi to sacrifice in cd seem likely to have been issued by his patron, not the god.

The drops in pāda a are (in my view) most likely the rain for which Śaṃtanu was eager (see esp. 1d, 3c).

As Old and HPS suggest, the thousand cows and a chariot in b sound like a Dakṣiṇā, but (*pace* both) I don't think this means that Śaṃtanu has to be identified with Indra – rather Indra has to give these items first, before they can be redistributed to Devāpi.

The middle voice of *yajasva* in c does not conform to its canonical later usage, since it here seems to be addressed to Devāpi, the officiating priest (who should be the subject of active forms of √*yaj*): *yajasva* would properly be addressed to the patron, i.e., Śaṃtanu.

X.98.5–6: The second half of 5 and all of 6 provide a textbook example of Lüders's heavenly ocean – which all too frequently otherwise seems to rest on flimsy evidence.

X.98.6: The waters confined in the higher sea sound very much like the waters confined by Vṛtra. Cf. I.32.11 ... *atiṣṭhan, níruddhā ā́paḥ* "The waters stood still, hemmed in" and our pāda b *ā́po devébhir nívṛtā atiṣṭhan* "The waters stood still, confined by the gods."

The hapax *mṛkṣínī-* is of unclear sense and etymology. I opt for a connection with √*mṛj* 'wipe, groom, curry' and, more narrowly, with the noun *mṛkṣá-* in VIII.66.3 meaning (in my

view) ‘currycomb’ (see comm. ad loc.). The tracks left by the rains gushing over the land in rivulets would resemble the tracks of a currycomb.

X.98.9: The bahuvrīhi *rohídaśva-* is otherwise only used of Agni, so the reference to Agni must persist in this vs., though he is unnamed.

X.98.11: The vṛddhi form *aulāná-* in d is utterly opaque; it is even unclear whether it is a personal name (most likely) or, as Gr would have it, the designation of an offering.

X.99 Indra

The Anukr. attributes this hymn to Vamra “Ant,” and in a playful spirit in the final summary vs. (12) the poet names himself as *vamraká-* ‘little ant’. There is no clear connection between this humorous self-deprecatory nickname and the often puzzling contents of the hymn, though an “ant couple” (*vamrásya ... mithunā́* appears in vs. 5).

On the pronominal skeleton that structures the hymn, see publ. intro. The lack of divine names in the hymn, noted in the publ. intro., invites the audience to try out multiple referents, and in fact a number of the vss., esp. in the early parts of the hymn, are ambiguous. In my view previous interpr. have been too quick to assume that Indra is the exclusive referent throughout the hymn.

The hymn has some striking similarities to I.51, an Indra hymn attributed to Savya Āṅgirasa. These include the “hundred-doored” vs. 3 : I.51.3 / ants vss. 5/12 : I.51.9 / Pipru vs. 11 : I.51.5 / Rjiśvan vs. 11 : I.51.5 / Kutsa+Śuṣṇa vs. 9 : I.51.6, 11 / Dasyus vss. 7–8 : I.51.6, 8.

X.99.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn begins with maximal referential uncertainty: the first vs. contains two questions about identity, with the two interrogatives *kám* and *kád*, opening the two hemistichs. Moreover, there is 2nd sg. address, via the verb *iṣaṇyasi*, with the 2nd sg. subject unidentified. And the pronominal gen. *tásya*, assuming (as most do) that it has personal reference (“of his/its”), is also unspecified. In fact, the only semantic anchor is the *vájra-* in d, further identified as *vṛtra-túr-* ‘obstacle/Vṛtra-overcoming’, which situates the verse in the larger Indra narrative.

In addition to the referential problems, there are a number of uncertainties in the syntax. These include – 1) do *citrám* and *vāśrám* belong together, as obj. of *iṣaṇyasi*, or is *vāśrám* separate and the obj. of *vāvṛdhádhyai*? 2) is *pṛthugmā́nam* a bahuvrīhi or a karmadhāraya? 3) is *śávasaḥ* (+/- *tásya*) to be construed with *dā́tu* or *vyùṣṭau*? 4) Is cd one clause or two? With regard to all these questions the publ. tr. takes a different stand from most other tr., views that I will in part now defend. I will also try to impose a bit more interpretive sense than the often vague publ. tr. did – though the hymn remains maddeningly opaque.

Let us begin with the 2nd ps. subject to the verb *iṣaṇyasi* in pāda a. The only things we know about this subject are 1) that it’s masc. (given the masc. pf. part. *cikitvā́n*) and 2) that he’s capable of setting in motion something bright (*citrám*) and he’s *cikitvā́n* (cognizant, observant, attentive). This pf. part. may be the clue to the referent: it is esp. common as a modifier of Agni, and since at the beginning of any RVic hymn a reference to the ritual fire would not be amiss, Agni is a reasonable suggestion. Here Agni could be sending out his bright beam (vel sim.). On the other hand, if we follow Ge (n. 1a) in supplying ‘song, praise’ with *citrám*, the addressee could be the poet, urged by his fellow officiants to send out his hymn on our behalf. I think either of these (or a combination of both – e.g., Agni acting in lieu of the poet) is plausible here.

As for *vāśrá-*, the evidence goes in several directions. The distance between the two words *citrám* and *vāśrám* (in separate pādas) and their proximity to two different verbal forms (*iṣaṇyasi* and *vāvṛdhádhyai*) disfavor construing them together. However, *vāśrá-* is often used of cows and the stem *iṣaṇya-* several times takes cows as obj. (III.50.3, IX.96.8); moreover, *vāśrá-* also modifies *gíraḥ* 'songs' in VIII.44.25 and so would still work if we think 'song, praise' is the object of *iṣaṇyasi*. The publ. tr. "bright bellower" does construe the two together as obj. of *iṣaṇyasi*, with the object of *vāvṛdhádhyai* left unspecified. However, I would entertain the alternative, "Which bright (hymn?) did you send ... to strengthen the bellower" – the interpr. of Ge (also Scar 190). In that case the referent of *vāśrám* is in question; Ge (n. 1b) suggests Indra. This is also plausible, though it should be noted that *vāśrá-* is never used of him elsewhere.

As for *pṛthu-gmā́nam*, it is generally taken as a bahuvrīhi (so, e.g., Gr 'breite Bahn habend', Gr 'breitspurigen'), modifying *vāśrám*. Its second-member accent would be paralleled by some (though not all) bahuvrīhis with 1st-member *pṛthu-* (e.g., *pṛthu-pā́jas-* 'of broad dimension'). However, the b.-v. interpr. goes back to the period in which the 2nd-member *-gmán-* was taken as a form of √*gam* 'go' (see the glosses given above and Gr s.v. "(*gmán*)"). It is now clear that it belongs to the 'earth' word (*kṣám-*), with a zero-grade *gm-* parallel to *jm-*. The apparent *-n*-stem we have here was backformed to the loc. **gm-án* (cf. loc. *jmán* and EWA s.v. *kṣám*). With 2nd-member *-gmán-* meaning 'earth', a b.-v. interpr., i.e., 'having the broad earth', no longer fits the context; see Scar's awkward and semantically stretched "den auf der weiten Erde {bekanntesten} Brüller." Instead, it must simply be a karmadhāraya meaning 'broad earth', here as an acc. extent of space with *iṣaṇyasi*. Old appositely compares voc. *pṛthu-jman* in AVŚ V.1.5, also showing a backformed *-an-* stem extracted from the loc.; again it must mean 'o broad earth', not *'o (one) having (a) broad earth'. Note also that in our vs. 2b the phrase *pṛthúṃ yónim* 'broad womb' is found in the same metrical position and refers to the same space, in my opinion.

The second hemistich brings a new set of problems. First, Ge takes cd as a single clause through *vájram* in d, with *vṛtratúram ápinvat* an unsignaled dependent clause ["(wenn)"], making *kát ... dā́tu* the subj. of *tákṣat* ("Welche Gabe wird ... die Keule zimmern"), an expression that seems strange even in the context of the general strangeness of RVic discourse. It seems more natural to take c as an independent nominal cl. (so also Scar). See below.

The next question is whether *dā́tu* belongs to √*dā* 'give' or √*dā* 'divide' (EWA's *DĀ*[4]): Ge opts for the former, Gr, Old, publ. tr. the latter, Scar either one. The decision rests in part on what *śávasaḥ* is construed with. Save for the publ. tr., it is universally taken with *vyùṣṭau* (e.g., Ge "im Erwachen seiner Kraft"; Scar "beim Aufflammen seiner ... Kraft"). But *vyùṣṭi-* is never construed with a genitive of anything but Uṣas -- except X.76.1 with *ūrjā́m* "at the first dawn flushes of nourishment," a passage that Ge. (n. 1c) adduces. But I take the expression there as referring to "the milk of the dawn cows"; see comm. ad loc. I prefer to take *śávasaḥ* here with *kát ... dā́tu* "what is his share/portion of strength?" This question would follow naturally upon the *vāvṛdhádhyai* that ends the preceding pāda: if either Indra or the hymn is what is to be strengthened in ab, then it makes sense to inquire how much strength he/it has received. I tr. *tásya* as "his," but if the question is about the hymn (as Scar tentatively suggests), "its" could be substituted. (Since Ge and Scar both take *tásya* as an independent genitive, as do I, there is no point in exploring the possibility of its modifying *śávasaḥ*.)

This brings us to pāda d. Here the problem is that it's too easy to fill in the blanks. There are two good possibilities for the subject of *takṣat*. As Ge points out (1d), Tvaṣṭar is quite frequently the subject of *tákṣad vájram* and related expressions (esp., in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn, I.32.2 *tváṣṭā ... vájram ... tatakṣa*). It is difficult to believe that the audience wouldn't

immediately think of Tvaṣṭar when confronted with *tákṣad vájram*, esp. with that noun qualified as *vṛtra-tuŕam*. Although Tvaṣṭar might be thought of as the default here, I actually favor Uśanā Kāvya, who also several times fashions the mace: see, e.g., I.121.12 ... *kāvyá uśánā* ... *vṛtraháṇam* ... *tatakṣa vájram* and comm. ad X.49.2. In my view is also found in this hymn in vs. 9, and so introducing him here would provide some continuity, whereas Tvaṣṭar has no further role here. Ge rejects Tvaṣṭar in favor of Soma, the referent (in his view) of *dā́tu* in c. I see his point: Tvaṣṭar seems like a red herring – too obvious in the otherwise hazy rhetoric of the hymn. But it may be that the poet wants to throw his audience a belated lifeline: nothing so far in the hymn gives any indication that Indra is the dedicand, so in the last pāda of the 1st vs. he sets up a situation that refers uniquely to Indra: the *vájra* and its unnamed, but easily supplied fashioner, and Indra's standard target *vṛtrá* (whether the personal Vṛtra or the generic 'obstacle') – without having to mention Indra's name or any of his epithets. In other words, pāda d is the semi-riddling answer to a riddle that hasn't been directly posed.

The last word *ápinvat* provides a last difficulty. It is accented; if it belongs with the apparent main clause introduced by *tákṣat*, it must begin a new asyndetic clause. This is how the publ. tr. takes it. One problem is that that interpr. assumes that the obj. is the *vájra* and the subj. the unnamed Tvaṣṭar. Each of these assumptions is less than ideal: the *vájra* doesn't "swell," at least literally, and Tvaṣṭar is not the most likely agent of such an action, We could supply "waters" as the obj. of *ápinvat*, which is a more natural VP, but Tvaṣṭar remains a less likely agent. By contrast, if we take *ápinvat* as part of an unmarked dependent cl., owing its accent to this subordination, it doesn't need to be initial in its cl. Its obj. can then be *vṛtratúram*, which need not be coreferential with *vájram* but instead refer to Indra (as in IV.42.8). This little clause could then depict Tvaṣṭar's supplying soma to Indra to swell him up. The drawbacks: 1) soma-supplying is not usually Tvaṣṭar's role either; 2) the (pseudo-)root √*pinv* is not used elsewhere of Indra's reaction to soma-drinking. Nonetheless, *pinv* and soma both inhabit the realm of the liquid, which is more than the *vájra* does, and so I propose an alternative tr. "(Tvaṣṭar) fashioned the mace, (when) he made swell the Vṛtra/obstacle-overcomer."

X.99.2: The long portion of the hymn with anaphoric *sá* as subject of every vs. (2–9) begins here, but this pronominal expression of the subject doesn't help as much as it might. We still lack explicit referent(s).

At least in the first hemistich the referent is, in my view, open. Although Indra is for most interpr. the default, Agni seems to me a distinct, indeed the likely, possibility for various reasons. To begin with, the other occurrence of instr. *dyutā́* in VI.2.6 is in a comparison of Agni's flashing with that of the sun, and it is overwhelmingly Agni who takes a seat on the ritual ground, here characterized as "the broad womb" (*pṛthúṃ yónim*) – though Ge (n. 2b) conjures up a few passages with Indra as subj. In favor of Agni see esp. VIII.29.2 with similar phraseology (*yóni-*, √*sad*, and *dyut-/dyot-*): *yónim éka ā́ sasāda dyótanaḥ*.

The second hemistich, with its own initial *sá* (therefore opening the [to me unlikely] possibility of different referents for ab and cd), likewise seems applicable to Agni or Indra (or neither). The unidentified subject has both nestmates (*sánīḷebhiḥ*) and a brother as helpers in his action. Ge (n. 2cd), who takes the subj. as Indra, identifies the nestmates as the Maruts, reasonably enough, and the brother as Viṣṇu, with less justification. The only passage I know of that names a brother of Indra is VII.55.5, where the brother is (oddly) Pūṣan. If the referent is Agni, the nestmates can be his flames; for this possibility see (admittedly obscure) X.31.6 *asyá sánīḷā ásurasya yónau* "in the womb of this lord are those of the same nest," where "this lord" is

most likely Agni (so also Ge). The lexical similarity to our passage (*ásura-*, *yóni-*, and *sáṇīḷa-*) is striking. Moreover, Agni's brothers are well known (cf. I.164.1, maybe X.11.2, and the story of the flight of Agni, with his brothers mentioned in X.51.6), and in IV.1.2 Varuṇa is named as his brother. The curiously indirect expression "not without his brother" (*bhrā́tur ná ṛté*) could reflect the story of Agni's failed attempt to escape his ritual role and the fate of his brothers. Contra most interpr., Old considers the *ná* here to be the simile particle; he suggests it means "as if without a brother," and indicates that the subject used the help of the *sánīḍa-* because he lacked a brother or his brother was somehow absent. This is an alternative worth considering, whoever the subject is meant to be.

The VP *prasahānáḥ ... māyā́ḥ* "overcoming *māyā*s is equally applicable to Agni and Indra. In V.2.9 Agni *prā́devīr māyā́ḥ sahate* "overcomes ungodly *māyā́ḥ*, while in VII.98.5 it is Indra: *yadéd ádevīr ásahiṣṭa māyā́ḥ* in almost identical words.

The identity of "the seventh" (*saptáthasya*) is unclear. Ge (n. 2cd) considers it to be one, or the first, of a group of seven well-known demons, possibly Vṛtra. (The passages Ge cites for the existence of this group are suggestive but not utterly convincing.) Old instead weakly endorses Bergaigne's view that it's Varuṇa, on the basis of vs. 10, but gives no reason why he'd be "seventh." With Ge (n. 2cd) I tentatively adduce X.49.8, where Indra claims to be *saptahán* 'the smasher of the seven'; that same vs. is connected with our vs. 7, and our vs. 9 has thematic and verbal parallels in X.49.3.

Note the predicated participle *prasahānáḥ*, the only verbal form in this hemistich; the opening *sá* makes it likely that cd is a clause independent of ab. Ge also takes it as separate.

For the unusual position of the negative *ná* in the configuration with *ṛté* + ABL., see comm. ad II.12.9. Here the particle does not coalesce with the following vowel in sandhi (unlike II.12.9), though such coalescence is characteristic of the negative.

X.99.3: Another obscure verse with obscure referents. Once again both Agni and Indra seem to me reasonable possibilities, though different pieces of the vs. fit one or the other better. Indeed at this point in the hymn Indra begins to outweigh Agni, who seems to me the more plausible referent of the first two vss., but who is being increasingly elbowed out as the hymn proceeds.

As for this vs., Indra is more generally associated with the winning of the sun, the topic of pāda b, than Agni. See, e.g., VI.17.8 *svàrṣātā vṛṇata índram átra* "They choose Indra here at the winning of the sun," though Agni also participates in this activity. For example, in X.8.6 Agni's head is *svarṣā́-* 'sun-winning'. Indra's signature verb √*han* is found in the pres. part. *ghnán* (d), and in general the aggressiveness of the vs. and even the drive to the prize in pāda a seem more characteristic of Indra. However, the phrase *abhí várpasā bhūt* "prevailed with his form" exactly matches the phrase in X.3.2 *kr̥ṣṇám yád énīm abhí várpasā bhū́t* "when with his form he has prevailed over black, mottled (Night)" of Agni, and *várpas-*, a term that seems to refer to an often indistinctly defined form or shape laid on top of another, is esp. associated with Agni (e.g., I.140.5, 7, 141.3; VI.3.4) and with the smoke that envelops him. (The same phrase *abhí várpasā bhū́t* also of course occurs near the end of this hymn in 11d.)

Ge interpr. the hapax instr. *ápa-duṣpadā* as 'not lame' ("mit einem Nichtlahmen"), with *ápa* functioning as a sort of privative to *duṣpád-* 'lame', lit. 'having a bad foot' (I.53.9). But *ápa-* isn't a privative prefix in the RV; the closest would be *ápa-vrata-* '(one) contrary to commandment', which is, however, distinct from *a-vratá-* 'without commandment' (see disc. ad I.51.9). Moreover, the context here favors a negative notion: the idea seems to be that the subject succeeds despite having bad equipment, not because his equipment is good (as "not lame" would

indicate). See the next vs., 4c, with *apā́daḥ ... arathā́ḥ* "(they, though) lacking feet and chariots ..." The interpr. of the cmpd by (Gr /) Old, "auf einem Weg, dem Schlimmfüssiges fern ist," better accounts for the *ápa*, but still errs by inserting a positive value in a context that invites a negative one. Old seems to mean that the subject is following a path that a lame person couldn't, and so it is a good one. This actually doesn't follow logically, but see Gr's paraphrase as "sichern Ganges." In contrast, I suggest that *ápa-* here has the same sense as archaic English "off" as in "off ox," the one further from the driver. So here the horse (if that's what the referent is) is lame, but since it's the off foot that's lame the driver (*yā́tar-*) may not have noticed this defect.

I have no idea what the "hundred-doored" (*śatádura-*) refers to; the same descriptor is found in I.51.3, associated with Atri, but otherwise unclear.

X.99.3–4: The negated nom. sg. *anarvā́* begins 3c, while 4a ends with *árvā*. The propinquity of these two forms highlights their semantic divergence: *árvan(t)-* refers to a horse, specifically a 'charger, steed', while the adj. *an-arván-* (etc.) means something like 'without assault / unassailing / unassailable'. Most of the philological energy has been expended upon accounting for the protean stem of the negated form (see the reff. in the lexical comm., inter alia), but I know of no real attempt (incl. by me) to reconcile the meanings. In RV the unnegated form refers only to a horse (real or metaphorical), but since *auruua(ṇt)-* is found as an adj. in Aves., incl. in the bahuvr. *auruuaṭ.aspa-* 'having *auruuant* horses', a meaning like 'headlong, breakneck, precipitous' could underlie the semantic development of RVic *anarván-*.

X.99.4: The vs. begins promisingly with an apparent Indraic theme: the youthfully exuberant streams (*yahvyò 'vánīḥ*) that the subject pours out (*ā́ juhoti*) could be the waters released by Indra after smashing Vṛtra. Both these fem. plurals are used in such a context (e.g., *avánīḥ* I.61.10, *yahvī́ḥ* V.29.2). However, the verb *ā́ √hu* introduces at least the metaphor of ritual oblation, and a different metaphor, that of a horse racing for the prize, is represented by *góṣu árvā ... pradhanyā̆su sasríḥ* "as a charger running for the cows that are at stake." By sheer number of words, this last image, of the racehorse, dominates the first hemistich. However, that image feeds back into the ritual one, since soma is regularly compared to a horse (e.g., IX.10.1=66.10 *árvanto ná śravasyávaḥ / sómāso rāyé akramuḥ*) running towards the cows, that is, the milk with which the soma will be mixed.

It is this ritual image that takes over the second hemistich – until the end. As Ge points out (n. 4cd), in IX.97.20 the soma-drinks are described as running, though "without reins, without chariots (*arathā́ḥ*, as here), unyoked," while the subjects of cd are "without feet ... without chariots." (Though the subjects here *are* yoked [*yújyāsaḥ*], this hardly matters: the drops are moving like teams of horses despite lacking horse tackle.) The bahuv. in d, *droṇy-àśva-* 'having wooden (cups) as horses', clinches the soma context, since *dróṇa-* is used only of the wooden cups into which soma is poured (see comm. ad VI.2.8). However, although *droṇī́-* confirms the soma-ritual context, it creates an awkward image. Soma cups aren't mobile, much less swift like horses; they are instead the stationary goal towards which the soma-horses are racing. And 'having wooden cups as horses' conjures up the comic image of the soma drinks clumping around in cartoon versions of Dutch wooden shoes. The ineptness of the image makes me wonder if we're once again changing imagery in midstream, as it were – though I don't have a good suggestion for what it might be. Gr paraphrases *droṇy-àśva-* as "Regenwolken als Rosse habend," and the apparent goal of the verb *ī́rate*, *ghṛtáṃ vā́ḥ* "ghee (and?) water," does not fit in

a soma context. This phrase is also found in X.12.3 *duhé yád énī divyáṃ ghṛtáṃ vā̃ḥ* "when the speckled (cow) gives as her milk the heavenly ghee, the water" – an apparent reference to rain (see publ. intro.). I there suggest that the speckled cow might be a rain cloud, but, *pace* Gr, I do not see how *droṇy-àśva-* could refer to the same. I confess myself baffled.

Ge takes *ī́rate* as transitive "strömen lassen," but med. forms of *ī́rte* are always intrans. and furthermore 'stream' is not one of the meanings of this stem. He recognizes the intrans. possibility in n. 4d.

X.99.5: For a change, the referent, at least of the first hemistich, is tolerably clear. The stem *ṛ́bhvan-* 'craftsman(?)' is used primarily of Indra, though, it must be admitted, several times of Agni. The association of the subject with the Rudras – in the plural almost always a designation of the Maruts – tips the balance towards Indra. See esp. the almost identical phrase adduced by Ge (n. 5a) describing Indra in I.100.5 *rudrébhir ṛ́bhvā*. The puzzle here comes from how the subject is described – as one "whose wish is unpraiseworthy" (*áśasta-vāra-*) but "who keeps disrepute at a distance" (*āré-avadya-*). It is striking that, in his first undoubted appearance in this hymn, Indra should enter under an ethical cloud, as it were. Now Indra in his long career does many disreputable things, but which one this is, and why it's brought up here, are questions to which I don't have answers. I seem to be alone in this uncertainty. Other interpr. (notably Ge, but also Old), try to connect the first hemistich with the second, in which the ant couple (*vamrásya ... mithunā́*) figures. This impulse is understandable but I don't think successful. It requires Indra, as supposed subj. of the verbs in d, to steal the food (of the ant couple or of unspecified other(s)) and make them cry. Indra's "unpraiseworthy wish" is, acdg. to Ge (n. 5a), to steal – in this case, to steal food. For Ge (n. 5c) this further entails (though I don't see the logical connection) that Indra turned into an ant in order to commit the theft, and his taking the ant-form from the ants that used to possess it left them uncovered (*vívavrī*). For Indra as thieving ant does Ge have in mind ants at a picnic (vel sim. – it's rather nice to imagine Ge picnicking in the German countryside)? I frankly find this ludicrous – I don't see the great god Indra having the ambition to become an ant and steal a crumb, nor do I imagine the victim of the theft of a crumb weeping over it.

I instead think that cd is a separate incident. In fact I take it as an animal fable in embryo, like those I identify in X.28 (q.v). The *manye* in c, "I think of," "this puts me in mind of," seems like a casual introduction to such a tale. And in fact a similar tale, though with a different ending, is familiar to all of us – the Ant(s) and the Grasshopper, attributed to Aesop. There the ants diligently store up food for the winter during the delightful summer, while the grasshopper mocks their toil while taking his pleasure. When winter comes and he is unprepared, he begs food from the ants, who refuse, and he starves. Here we might be confronting an alternative version, in which the ants' stockpiled food is plundered while they are out of their lair. Not surprisingly this theft makes them cry when they discover it. My interpr. leaves the subject of *arodayat* and *muṣāyán* unspecified (certainly *not* Indra, in my view), but if the story was well known, the identity of the thief would be too. (For what it's worth, acdg. to the internet there are numerous species of ants in India, also of grasshoppers, including a large and visually striking one called the aak or painted grasshopper [Poekilocerus pictus].)

What then would be the connection between ab and cd. In my opinion, it's not the unpraiseworthy wish and the evaded disrepute, but rather leaving one's home. Indra came here *hitvī́ gáyam* "having left behind / abandoned his home"; the ant couple are *vívavrī* 'without/outside their covering/lair." Notably *vavrím* serves as object to √*hā* 'leave' twice:

IX.69.9 *hitvī́ vavrím* ... / IX.71.2 *jáhāti vavrím*. Although my interpr. of the vs. leaves several loose ends – why did Indra abandon his home? (a question not addressed by Ge either), what was his unpraiseworthy wish? who stole the food? – the answers previously provided to these questions seem unsatisfactory to me.

X.99.6: The referential whiplash continues here. Having just learned in the last vs. that Indra left his home behind, the subject of this vs. is identified with the archaic phrase *pátir dán* "lord of the house" – a phrase more appropriate for Agni, so often identified as *gṛhápati-*, *dámūnas-*, and similar designations, than Indra and used of Agni in I.149.1, probably I.153.4, and in a variant (*śíśur dán*) in X.61.20; it is applied to Indra (somewhat oddly) only in X.105.2. But the actions recounted in our vs. belong to Indra, or to his older alloform Trita Āptya. As Ge (n. 6) points out, this vs. concerns the same deed(s) as are found in X.8.7–8. There, curiously, a muddling of the identities of Agni and Indra, not to mention Trita, is also found. As discussed in the publ. intro. as well as in the comm. to X.8, the three vss. concerning the slaying of Viśvarūpa (X.8.7–9) are appended to an Agni hymn (X.8) at the end of an Agni cycle (X.1–8). This myth goes back to Indo-Iranian times, with an Avestan version where figures corresponding to Trita Āptya, namely Θrita and Āϑβiia, are found. In RV X.8.7–9 the hero who slays Viśvarūpa morphs before our eyes. In vs. 7 the subject is *tritá-*, which can be read simultaneously as Trita and as "the third (fire)," namely Agni. In the next vs. (8) Trita Āptya is named as the slayer of "the three-headed, seven-reined" (*triśīrṣā́ṇam saptárāsmim*) enemy, like the "six-eyed, three-headed" (*ṣaḷakṣáṃ triśīrṣā́ṇam*) Dāsa here, but he was urged on by Indra (*índreṣita-*). But in the final vs. (9) Indra has supplanted Trita Āptya as the slayer of the three-headed Viśvarūpa; he is not just an enthusiastic bystander. The same blurring of identities seems to be found in this vs.: as just noted, the phrase *pátir dán* suggests Agni; the default referent is Indra; and Trita (otherwise unknown in this hymn) is explicitly named as the slayer in c. The phrase *asyá ... ójasā vṛdhānáḥ* "grown strong through his might" is in fact ambiguous as to the referent of *asyá*. Although we might expect *asyá* to refer to Trita, the subject, it is possible that *asyá* is Indra, referring to the same invigoration of Trita by Indra that is found in X.8.8 *índreṣita-*.

The last pāda tosses in further confusion. Here the victim is specified as a boar (*varāhá-*), a rare word and one that doesn't occur in this myth elsewhere. And the weapon is "metal-tipped poetic inspiration" (*vipā́ ... áyoagrayā*), a curious and clashing phrase, both internally and externally. (I suppose we might paraphrase it as "weaponized rhetoric.") But this discordant element can also be interpr. in the context of the version in X.8.7–9. As I argue there (see comm. ad loc.), the weapons that Trita uses there are words, and the myth is assimilated to the Vala myth, in which the cave is opened by verbal means. The same explanation can account for the much abbreviated expression here as well.

Note the rhyming pāda-final monosyllables *dán* (a) and *han* (d) of the first and last pādas. There is also internal near-rhyme in pāda d: (*var)āhám* immediately precedes the caesura, while (*áyoagray)ā han* ends the pāda, with *-āhaN* positioned before the two metrical breaks. Verse-final *han* is also picked up by the verse finals of 7 and 8; see below.

With *áyo-agra-* here compare *áyo-apāṣṭi-* 'having metal claws' in 8d.

X.99.7–8: The last word of 7, *dasyuhátye*, is expanded into the last phrase of 8, *hanti dásyūn*. This word order is somewhat anticipated by the full phrase following the caesura in 7d, *(ar)han dasyuhátye*. And recall the *han* that ends vs. 6.

X.99.7: At least we can be tolerably certain that Indra is the referent of this vs. The stem *arśasāná-* (on which see further below) in b is elsewhere used of an enemy of Indra's; Indra is associated elsewhere with Nahus (e.g., X.49.8) (c); and he is of course a master splitter of fortresses and smasher of Dasyus (d).

The stem *arśasāná-* is generally taken as a PN for a demonic enemy of Indra's – throughout the publ. tr. and in the standard tr., as well as Mayr PN. It may indeed be a PN, but I now consider its formation to be contextually driven. The form appears three times independently in the RV (I.130.8=VIII.12.9, II.20.6, and here). In two of these three occurrences it is found in conjunction with a participle or pseudo-participle in *-(a)sāná-*. The clearest ex. is I.130.8fg in Atyaṣṭi meter, where it is part of the rhyme pāda: *... tatṛṣāṇám oṣati, ní arśasānám oṣati* "... scorches the thirsty, scorches the *arśasāná-*," where the two forms are near phonological matches. (VIII.12.9 repeats the g pāda but lacks the f pāda.) The occurrence in our vs. immediately follows one ending in *ūrdhvasāná-*, a patently artificial *-(a)sāná-* form. Note that one of the best established of these forms is found in vs. 9, *śavasāná-*. (Both parallels pointed out already by Old.) On the type see comm. ad IV.3.6 and AiG II.2.236–37. The only independent occurrence of *arśasāná-* that lacks an *-(a)sāná-* form in its context is II.20.6, but this passage in fact is verbally connected with this one (as Old and Ge [n. 7a] point out): the pāda preceding the form of *arśasāná-* contains the phrase *ūrdhvó bhuvan mánuṣe*, a paraphrase (or at least equivalent) of our *mánuṣa ūrdhvasānáḥ.* I'm therefore inclined to take *arśasāná-* as belonging to the shadowy root √*ṛś* 'harm' (so Wh. Roots), built to the *s*-stem *árśas-* 'harm' (supposedly VS+), as suggested in EWA s.v. *arśasāná-* (and adumbrated by Gr s.v. *arś*); many of the *-asāná-* formations of course sit next to *s*-stems (like *śavasāná-* : *śávas-*). The form may still be a PN, but perhaps it would be better to tr. "Harmer."

In c Ge takes the superlative *nṛ́tama-* as standing for a comparative and the phrase *nṛ́tamo náhuṣaḥ* as equivalent to Indra's boast in X.49.8 *náhuṣo náhuṣṭaraḥ* "(I am) more Nahus than Nahus." (For another passage with *náhuṣaḥ* + COMP, see I.122.10 *náhuṣaḥ ... śárdhastaraḥ* "more forceful than N.," there of a human patron.) In the publ. tr. I rejected this interpr. and instead construed *náhuṣaḥ* with what follows: *náhuṣo 'smát sújātaḥ* on the basis of X.80.6 *mā́nuṣo náhuṣo ví jātā́ḥ* "those born variously from Manu and from Nahus" and IX.88.2 *víśvā nahuṣyā̃ṇi jātā́* "all creatures stemming from Nahus," with *-jāta-* as here — tr. "well born from Nahus and from us." I now think this was wrong, because Nahus is the progenitor of humans, of Ārya (see comm. ad VI.26.7, etc.), and Indra decidedly does not fit this category. I would now emend the tr. to something closer to Ge's: "He, more manly than Nahus, because of us split the fortresses ..." I'm following Ge in taking *asmát* as an abl. of cause, though an alt. might be to take it parallel to or dependent on *náhuṣaḥ* "more manly than Nahus, than us" or "more manly than Nahus from among us."

X.99.8: In b the Pp reads *vidát*, a 3rd sg. injunc., and the publ. tr. accepts this analysis. However, there is no good reason for the accent; although Old endorses the Pp reading, he lumps this passage with others for which he can find no explanation for the accent (ZDMG 60: 736 [=KlSch p. 211]), and in fact in n. 5 on that page he considers the masc. pres. part. *vidán* to be a possible alternative. Against the part. interpr. are two facts: the part. stem *vidánt-* is otherwise unattested (though there is no obstacle to such a form existing), and the main clause of the first hemistich would lack a finite verb. Still, I now prefer to take it as a predicated pres. part. rather than a finite verb with unmotivated accent and would change the tr. to "He ... is the one finding a way ..." For another pred. tense-stem part. in this hymn, see vs. 2.

Note the pronominal doubling in b: *no asmé*. It's possible that the two are not doubled but are meant to be construed separately: "finding for us a way to peaceful dwelling for us" or even "... for us to dwell peacefully." Ge (n. 8b) adduces the identical pronominal sequence, but split over the pāda boundary, in VI.50.3 ... *no*, *asmé kṣáyāya*, a phrase that also includes the same dative goal. The publ. tr. of that passage interpr. the sequence as doubling, but it's possible there too that the pronouns should be construed separately. See comm. ad loc.

The publ. tr. renders pl. *śárīraiḥ* as "with his limbs," but this sounds awkward, to say the least. I would now, with Ge, substitute "with his body."

áyo-apaṣṭi- 'metal-clawed' of d echoes *áyo-agra-* 'metal-tipped' in 6d.

X.99.9: The pronominal structure that dominates the hymn changes mid-verse: the first hemistich begins with *sá*, the second with *ayám*. This may signal Indra's approaching epiphany. Because of the prominence of the pronominal skeleton, I would slightly alter the tr. of the first pāda to "He, along with ...," rather than having the subject pronoun parenthetical and deep in the clause.

With Ge I supply a verb in pāda a, rather than construing *vrā́dhataḥ* with *párādat* at the end of b. It is easy to borrow √*han* from 8d. Cf. IV.32.3 *háṃsi vrā́dhantam ójasā* with the same VP.

I dealt with this vs. extensively in my 2009 "An Indo-Iranian Priestly Title Lurking in the Rig Veda?" (Fs. Salomon), esp. 114–16, apropos of the hapax *kṛpáṇe* (and the similar hapax *kārpāṇé* in X.22.10 (see comm. ad loc.). I argue there that these two words are deformations of an Indo-Iranian priestly title, found in Avestan as *karapan* (always disyllabic, i.e., **karpan-*). Part of my argument rests on the association in this passage of the equivalents of the Aves. priestly trio, *kauui-*, *usij-*, and *karapan-*, namely *kaví-* (pāda c) and *auśijá-* (11a), the vṛddhi deriv. of *uśíj-*. For further disc. of this apparent mythic complex, incl. its association in various parts of the RV with the Śuṣṇa / Kutsa myth, see the art. cit., esp. pp. 112–16 and nn. 12–13.

As indicated in that art., I consider the Kavi in c to be a reference to Uśanā Kāvya, who figures prominently in the Śuṣṇa / Kutsa story (see n. 12 in art. cit.). The mysterious cloak in pāda d is also found in a Śuṣṇa / Kutsa / (Uśanā) Kavi passage in X.49.3; see the extensive disc. there. In that passage Indra does some sort of harm to a cloak "for the poet" (i.e., for Uśanā Kāvya in my opinion); in our passage it is unclear what happens to the cloak. Ge thinks the poet wore / put on the cloak (cf. also JSK DGRV I.367 "who (put on) his (i.e. Indra's) cloak," supplying the verb *avasta*). This is not impossible, but a more economical solution is to construe *átkam* with the only verbal form in the rel. cl., the agent noun *sánitā* (so, actually, Gr). Besides avoiding the need to supply a verb out of nowhere, this can also explain the position of *utá*, which causes JSK some distress because, if the syntagm is *sánitotá nṛṇā́m*, *utá* is in "enclitic" position. If, however, we read *sánitā* with what proceeds as well as what follows, *utá* can connect the constructions that share *sánitā*. In my view, the cloak originally belonged to Śuṣṇa (contra Ge n. 3a [though he considers this as an alternative in n. 3a] and JSK) and was awarded to Uśanā Kāvya, probably because of the help he provided Indra in the Śuṣṇa fight, as I suggest ad X.49.3. I also suggest there that Śuṣṇa's cloak may have consisted of *māyā́ḥ*; note *māyī́* in the next vs. (10b), as well as in 2d.

For another connection between our hymn and X.49, see vs. 7 and X.49.8.

X.99.10: In pāda a *náryebhir asya* echoes *śavasānébhir asya* in 9a, and the *nárya-* picks up the *nṛṇā́m* that ends vs. 9. It is not clear whether *náryebhiḥ* should be construed with *devébhiḥ* in b

as a single constituent (so Ge) or the two instr. refer to different groups (so, implicitly, the publ. tr.).

I would substitute "uncanny" for "magic" in b.

In c *avedi* could belong either to √*vid* 'know' or √*vid* 'find'. The publ. tr. takes it to the latter, Ge (and Scar 310) to the former. I am now inclined to change my allegiance to 'know', with some slight rearrangements of the rest of the pāda. Flg. Scar, I would supply 'even, already' with *kanī́naḥ*, referring to Indra's early forays into soma-drinking. The qualifier *ṛtupā́ḥ* 'drinking acdg. to ritual sequence' may be euphemistically polite here, if the reference is to Indra's commandeering Tvaṣṭar's soma right after his birth (e.g., IV.18.3). My revised tr.: "This one here, (even) as a lad, became known as drinking according to the ritual sequence."

The verb of d, *ámimīta*, is taken to mean "changed into" (verwandelte) by Ge, who suggests that the form is an "entgleiste" form of **aminīta* (to √*mī* '(ex)change'). This root affiliation is also held by Sāy., Gr, Thieme (see Kü 370), Kü 369–70, and Lub, but I see no reason not to assign it to √*mā* 'measure', where it would be the correct 3rd sg. mid. impf. There is no evidence that Indra was transformed into Araru – though Indra's shape-shifting seems to be a bit of an idée fixe of Ge's for this hymn: see his peculiar view that Indra turned into an ant in 5c. Rather, the default scenario would be that Araru is yet another enemy that Indra handily dispatched. I take *ámimīta* to mean 'measured himself against, gave his (full) measure against," an abbreviated form of a phrase like V.31.7 *ójaḥ...ámimīthāḥ* "you measured out your strength against ..."

X.99.11: Verse-init. *asyá* is the last of the initial deictics in this part of the hymn; it would be better to give it a more prominent position in the tr.: "Through praises to him, AṚ ..."

On *auśijá-* see comm. above ad vs. 9.

In c Ge (n. 11c) emends *yajatáḥ* to **yájataḥ* gen. sg. of the pres. act. part., construing it with *gī́ḥ* ("die Lobrede des Opfernden"), while Old takes *gī́ḥ* as a masc. 'singer' (see Noten ad I.37.10 n. 1, with several other such occurrences suggested, none of them convincing). Neither of these makeshifts seems necessary. The publ. tr. instead takes c as containing two parallel subord. clauses: the nominal *sútvā yád yajatáḥ* "when the one worthy of the sacrifice possesses the soma-pressing" and *(yád) dīdáyad gī́ḥ* "(and when) the song will shine." For the synaesthesia of the latter, see VI.16.36 *bráhma ... yád dīdáyat*.

X.99.12: This summary vs. contains a pun on the poet's name (or at least the poet as identified by the Anukramaṇī), Vamra 'Ant'. Here he identifies himself as 'Little Ant' (*vamraká-*); the presence of the pl. *paḍbhír* 'with feet' indicates that the subject is not conceived of as a two-footed human. The ant of course also occurs in vs. 5.

X.100 All Gods

On the structure of the hymn and on the refrain, see publ. intro.

X.100.1: Old considers *tvā́vat* adverbial, leading to a convoluted rendering "Indra, sei fest, Gabenreicher, in der dir eignen Weise, damit man (dich) geniesse" (with a slightly less convoluted, but still unconvincing paraphrase offered immed. after). The interpr. as a neut., the subj. of *bhujé*, is snappier and conforms better to the sense of pāda b.

A nice rhyming figure in b: *stutáḥ suta(pā́ḥ)*, which is echoed by *śrutáṃ* in c.

With Ge I supply 'speech, word' vel sim. with *śrutám*, but take the latter as proleptic: "help (the speech) (such that it is) heard," rather than attributive like Ge's "dem gehörten (Worte)." I do not, with Old, consider it an early ex. of *śrutá-* meaning 'learning'.

X.100.2: The publ. tr.'s "bring forward for the taking" loses the etymological figure in *bhárāya ... bharata*, but something like "bring forward for bearing away," which better captures it, is less idiomatic.

As Ge points out, *bhāgám ṛtvíyam* is found also in I.135.3 (in the nom.), also of Vāyu.

There is no agreement on the meaning or structure of the hapax *krandád-iṣṭi-*, with both the cmpd type and the root affiliation of the 2nd member variably interpr.: Gr "mit Brausen dahineilend," Ge "der den brausenden (Soma) wünscht" (sim. Re "qui aime (le *soma*) hurlant"), Old (ZDMG 61: 474) "unter Gebrüll sein Suchen betreibend," Burrow (see Lowe, Part. 272 n. 75) "conquering riches," Scar (314) "wenn er brausend daherkommt." It surely should be interpr. in conjunction with the rhyming cmpd *bhandád-iṣṭi-*, likewise a hapax (V.87.1). In both cases I take *-iṣṭi-* to √*iṣ* 'desire, seek' and the cmpd. as a bahuvrīhi with an intrans. (pseudo-)participial 1st member. Here 'having a roaring quest' (vel sim.), whose English has been somewhat adjusted for parsability. My interpr. is closest to Old's quoted above. On these two *-ád-iṣṭaye* cmpds, see comm. ad V.87.1 and Lowe (Part., 270–72, esp. 272 with n. 75). Curiously Lowe does not treat *bhandád-iṣṭi-* and *krandád-iṣṭi-* as parallel and does not commit to a semantic or functional interpr. of either, though his diachronic account of the dev. of non-governing pseudo-participial cmpds is persuasive.

This is the only occurrence of *gaurá-* in the RV that Gr identifies as meaning 'white' (as opposed to 'buffalo'), and his assessment appears to be correct. Although it's tempting to unify all the RVic occurrences and therefore translate "of the buffalo milk" vel sim. here, EWA (s.v.) indicates that the color term is well represented across both Middle Indic and Middle Iranian languages.

X.100.3: The publ. tr. renders the subjunctive *sāviṣat* with modal "may he impel"; I would now change to "he will impel." The point is that we can count on Savitar to provide us with the requisite energy to do our ritual duty.

Note the etym. figure *savitā sāviṣat*; Savitar often participates in such figures.

The adverbial *pākavát* 'guilelessly' connects semantically with the refrain for the first time.

X.100.4: As in vs. 3, pāda c begins with *yáthā* (actually the āmreḍita *yáthā-yathā*), but the *yáthā*'s have different functions in the two vss. In vs. 3 it introduces a purpose clause, while here it provides a clausal comparison.

The sense and syntactic configuration of c are not agreed upon. Brereton (Ādityas 35, fld. more or less by Klein, Āmreḍitas; see also Ober. Relig. II.183) takes the gods of ab as the subject of *saṃdadhúḥ*: "according to the terms of the alliance they agreed to" (Klein: "precisely as (if) they had made friendship-pacts with us"). However, these interpr. can't work because the verb is not dual, but the first hemistich only mentions Indra and Soma. Both Ge and Re supply dummy subjects ("man," "les hommes") for *saṃdadhúḥ*, with *mitrádhitāni* as obj. I think they are closer to the correct interpr., but I prefer to take *mitrádhitāni* as the subject. From this cmpd I pull *mitrá-* out to serve both as the noun modified by *mitrádhitāni* and as the object, but using different senses of *mitrá-*. As the subj. it means 'pact, alliance', as the object 'ally' (as it does as

the 1st cmpd member, in my view), yielding "(alliances) concluded by allies bind (them [=allies]) together." This may seem overly tricky, but it allows the crucial word *mitrá-* to dominate. As for the connection of c to the first hemistich, the idea seems to be that we're trying to forge the same kind of relationship with the gods as we do with each other.

X.100.5: I take *párus-* as referring to the articulations or joints of the sacrifice, on the basis of X.53.1 *yajñásya vidvā́n páruṣaś cikitvā́n* "knowing the sacrifice, attentive to its articulation." On *párus-* in general see comm. ad IX.15.6. For similar phraseology, but with "sacrifice" as obj., see I.3.11 *yajñáṃ dadhe sárasvatī* "Sarasvatī has received our sacrifice." That the sacrifice is at issue is suggested by pāda c. Alternatively *párus-* could refer to the joint of the soma plant and thence to soma itself (so Gr); for a parallel see III.22.1 *sutáṃ dadhé.* (I favor the first suggestion.) Others (Old, Ge, Re, HPS [119]) take *párus-* as referring to an actual limb or joint, which produces a grotesque image—Indra (or us) with a super-bendable arm or with three arms?!—leading in turn to a watered-down interpr.: that Indra grows strong (Ge n. 5a) or (Old) acquires or grants "Fähigkeit gelenkiger Bewegung."

X.100.6: Both Ge and Re take *súkṛtam* as the predicate: "Indra's divine might is well made." This is of course possible, but the pāda-initial position of *índrasya* and its parallelism with *agníḥ* in the same position in b support my interpr.

My interpr.—that the sacrifice is *our* dear intimate—may seem somewhat strange, but it should be judged in conjunction with 5c, where the sacrifice is our father. Moreover, *ántama-* overwhelmingly refers to intimacy or nearness to *us*. Both Ge and Re take the more conventional route, assuming that the sacrifice should be dear to the gods (Re: "aux dieux" supplied) or (Ge) "der Kennerschaft genehm," with an unsupported interpr. of *vidátha-* (found also in his tr. of VII.84.3, adduced as parallel, n. 6c). Both also render the injunc. *bhūt* as a modal, though that is certainly not necessary, and I prefer a preterital interpr.

X.100.7: *duṣkṛtám* plays against *súkṛtam* of 6a, though the accent difference distinguishes the adj. *súkṛta-* (versus *sukṛtá-* 'good work') from the nominal *duṣkṛtá-* 'ill-doing'.

As indicated in the publ. intro., in this vs. the refrain becomes an integral part of the vs. as we disavow bad behavior and untruth and lay claim to wholeness and innocence. The vs. serves as a rough omphalos, though it is not in the exact center of the hymn. However, the *duṣkṛtám* (6a) : *súkṛtam* (7a) contrast may link vss. 6 and 7, and the two vss. could form an omphalos in the exact center.

Both Ge and Re take the pāda boundary between a and b more seriously than I do: in their interpr. the ill-doing would have been committed in secret, and the god-angering in the open. This seems peculiar to me, as if doing ill in the open would have been ok. Surely what is meant is a categorical denial of ill-doing under any circumstances, in a standard disjunctive merism of the type "neither by day nor by night."

My rendering of pāda c differs significantly from the standard. Most (Old, Ge, Re, KH [102: reproducing Ge's tr.]) take the gods, present as voc. *devāḥ*, as 2nd ps. subj. and supply a verb like 'punish' (e.g., Ge "Nicht (sollt ihr) Götter uns ... (bestrafen)"). Although this makes reasonable sense after the first hemistich, it still requires supplying a verb out of thin air. It also requires *mā́kis* to have 2nd ps. reference (lit. "let no one (of you gods) ...") or to function simply as a prohibitive negative. (That KH cites it in a set of passages with unadorned *mā́* would indicate that he takes no account of the *-kis*.) But *mā́kis* (and *nákis*) have only 3rd ps. reference

and are overwhelmingly nominative (for potential counterexx. and their explanations, see comm. ad X.11.9 and I.147.5). The phrase *ánṛtasya vápasaḥ* also does not fit easily into such an interpr.: *várpas-* must be taken as 'mere/false appearance', which might lead the gods to punish us wrongly. But though *várpas-* may be an indistinct shape (see comm. ad X.99.3 above), it does not seem to be a false one. My tr. avoids supplying a verb and ascribing 2nd ps. value to *mā́kis*; we (or rather "no one of us") remain the subject, and *ánṛtasya vápasaḥ* is a genitive of quality.

X.100.8: The phrase *savitā́ sāviṣat* repeats the same phrase in vs. 3 – a responsion that might support the omphalos-structure interpr. (see immed. above). In vs. 3 Savitar impels good things towards the sacrifice and sacrificer; here by contrast he impels bad things away from it.

Both Ge and Re take *ádrayaḥ* as "mountains" (die Berge, les montagnes), an interpr. I find puzzling. The stem *ádri-* is extremely common as a designation for the pressing stones (see, e.g., X.76.2 cited for other reasons below); the alternate term *grā́van-* is found in the next pāda (and in 9a); and the context is entirely a ritual one.

On the unusual usage of the explicit passive *ucyáte* see comm. ad X.64.15, which contains the identical pāda.

X.100.9: The form *sotári* has caused no end of problems, though it seems uncomplicated to me. I take it as the loc. sg. of the well-attested *-tár*-stem *sotár-* 'presser', with standard agent-noun value. Here I think it's a single-word loc. absol.: "when the presser (is there)" / "the presser being (present)." But I seem to be alone in this: see comm. ad X.76.2, which contains the identical form. Here Ge takes it as a nom. sg. modifying *grā́van-*, Re sim., both flg. Old (ZDMG 55), who endorses the Ludwig/Neisser theory that there are nom. sgs. in *-tari*, which I find implausible; Tichy (*-tar-* p. 60) considers forms in *-tári* to be locatives to verbal abstracts, here "beim Somapressen." I do not see the need for these evasions of a morphologically straightforward form to a stem whose other 12 occurrences all mean 'presser'.

X.100.10: As Ge points out (n. 10b), the cows stand for the milk to be mixed with soma.

Ge (n. 10c) flg. Sāy. suggests that the cows' milk is "medicine" for the soma, presumably because without the milk mixture the soma is intolerably sharp to drink. But the failure to identify which bodies are referred to seems deliberate, and I wonder if the soma+milk is (also?) medicine for our bodies.

X.100.11: The "singer" (*jaritā́*) in pāda a is almost surely Agni, not an indefinite mortal ritual officiant ("ein Sänger": Ge, Scar [332]). Agni was so identified in 6b: *agnír gṛhé jaritā́ médhiraḥ kavíḥ*, and in that hemistich Indra was his foil (6a), as he is here (11b).

The referent of *yásya* in c is unclear: *whose* heavenly udder is full for pouring? The only referent in the vicinity is Indra in b, but this doesn't make much sense. I think it must refer to soma, even though soma is only obliquely referred to, as *suta-* in the gen. pl. *sutā́vatām* in b.

X.100.12: The final vs. lacks the refrain pāda and is in Triṣṭubh, not the Jagatī of the rest of the hymn. Nonetheless its connection with the preceding vs. is affirmed by the root-noun cmpd *kratu-prā́-*, which picks up *kratu-prā́van-* in 11a – and contrasts with *jaraṇi-prā́-* in the next pāda, 12b. As the publ. intro. points out, neither the internal structure of the vs. nor its conceptual connection with the rest of the hymn is clear. The first pāda happily celebrates an unidentified

referent, but the second introduces rivals who seem to pose a threat. The second hemistich could be a fragment of a dānastuti -- or not.

Although the referent of *te* in pāda a is not specified, it must be Agni. The bahuvrīhi *citrá-bhānu-*, matched here in the syntagm *citrás te bhānúḥ*, almost always modifies Agni. Moreover *kratuprā́ḥ* is a variant of *kratuprā́vān* in 11a, which, as we just saw, refers to Agni.

The sense of pāda b turns on the meaning of the hapax *jaraṇi-prā́-*, obviously coined in opposition to *kratu-prā́-*. The pāda sets up a set of rivals (*spṛ́dhaḥ*), who may (or may not) be menacing (to you, Agni, or to us). The adj. *ádhṛṣṭa-* 'unassailable' might indicate that they do pose a threat, but *jaraṇi-prā́-* has been taken in two opposing senses—though there is general agreement that *jaraṇi-* belongs with *jaraṇá-* 'old', *jaraṇā́-* 'old age', etc. For some (notably Gr, Re, and Scar [332 and 333]), the force of the compound is essentially negative: those qualified by it suffer from the frailty and decrepitude of old age (e.g., Re "qui parachèvent (leur propre) décrépitude") and therefore are no longer a threat. The problem with this interpr. is that it has to be squared with *ádhṛṣṭa-*, and it takes all of Re's characteristic parenthetical sleight of hand to do so – via the parenthetical "(tout en passant à tort pour) inexpugnables," an addition for which there is no textual support. With Old and Ge (in somewhat different ways), I think that the cmpd is essentially positive: they "fulfill their old age," that is, they live a successful life, to full term (escaping early death at our hands or Indra's) (see Ge's n. 12b). For the desire to secure old age, see V.41.15, 17 and X.59.4, as well as VII.61.2 (cited by Scar [333]). What is positive for the rivals is of course negative for us. On this interpr., pāda b is a reminder that threats remain, despite the generally sunny outlook of the last few vss.

As for the second hemistich, we can start with the fact that the last word, *duvasyúḥ*, is also, acdg. to the Anukr., the name of the poet (Duvasyu Vāndana). However, this supposed poet is found nowhere else, and it seems best to take the word in the usual sense of its stem (and its variant *duvoyú-*) and related denom. *duvasyá-* 'offer friendship / friendly service [to a god or gods]'. On this stem, see comm. ad IX.65.3.

Acdg. to Ge (n. 12cd), the subject of the clause is the poet, who is seeking a dakṣinā, in an image drawn from racing for the prize of cows or tracking cows. This seems reasonable, though some of the details are hazy.

The verb *tū́tūrṣati* is the only attestation of this desid. stem (on which see Heenen [Desid. 154–55], with a fanciful explan. of the long reduplication). It could belong to √*tṝ* or √*tvar*, though it is usually ascribed to the former (or a development thereof). Morphologically it seems akin to the perfect optative stem *tuturyā́-* (4x), though there is no special connection between their usages. In the publ. tr. I render it "seeks to rush," though this is not altogether satisfactory. The problem is compounded by immed. flg. *pári*, which does not appear as a preverb with either √*tṝ* or √*tvar*. I now think that *pári* has to be considered in conjunction with the heavy opening phrase *rájiṣṭhayā rájyā* "with/in the straightest line": *pári* 'around' provides a strong semantic contrast. My "to round up" attempts to express the contrast, and I think it is fundamentally correct, though I wish there were a better way to integrate the verb and the preverb in Engl. I have no view on the long redupl.

I take the obj. of the round up to be *paśvá ā́ góḥ ... ágram* "the foremost of bovine stock," but the supposed gen. phrase is problematic both because of *páśváḥ* and of *ā́*. To take the latter first, the pāda-final phrase *ā́ góḥ* occurs three times elsewhere, all in Maṇḍala IV (IV.3.9, 22.4, 23.6). In none of these passages is its function or even the case form of *góḥ* clear (see comm. ad locc.); at least twice it may be an abl., which would make better sense of *ā́*. However, here I think the phrase should be gen. with *ágram*. As for *paśváḥ*, is it being used to generalize

the *góḥ*, as in my tr. "bovine *stock*" (cf. Ge "der Rinderherde"; Re "bétail (consistant en) vache(s)") – or does it refer to a distinct animal, as in Watkins' (1979 Folk Taxonomy of Wealth," 278 = 1994 Sel.Wr. II, 653) "sheep (and) cow," metonymically "flock (and) herd" (for disc. see Sojkova, 2022, *Animals in Vedic Prose*, DPhil. diss. Oxford Univ., pp. 31–32)?

The noun *ráji-* 'line' is found only here, with differently accented *rají-* occurring in X.105.2 (see comm. ad loc.). On the accentuation see Lub. (Nominal Acc. 30), who considers the form here the accentually innovating one, perhaps because of its occurrence in a phrase containing *rájiṣṭha-*.

X.101 All Gods or Priest(s)

X.101.1–2: The first two vss. contain seven straight 2nd pl. mid. impvs in *-dhvam*, five of them in vs. 2. Of those in vs. 2, four are identical (or almost): *kṛṇudhvam* (a, b, c) ~ *íṣkṛṇudhvam* (c). The repetition of this heavy clump of morphology makes a marked impression, quite distinct from the usual fleet and quicksilver RVic style. It may be meant to imitate the rhythmic predictability of a work song. In any case it gives a more demotic impression.

The last pāda of vs. 2 breaks the string of middle impvs. with an active 2nd pl. impv., *prá nayatā*, followed by one opening vs. 3, *yunákta*. But there's a last gasp of *-dhvam* in (*ví*) ... *tanudhvam* closing 3a, replicating (*ā́) tanudhvam* at the end of 2a. Another clutch of *kṛṇudhvam-*s is found in vss. 7–8 and some more *-dhvam*-s in vss. 10–11.

X.101.1: The first verb of the hymn *úd budhyadhvam* may be responsible for the name of the poet in the Anukramaṇī, Budha. On the name see Ge's n. 2 (bottom of page).

Agni and Uṣas are of course associated with Dawn and the early morning sacrifice. The presence of Dadhikrā, the deified racehorse, is somewhat puzzling. Re (Hymnes spéc.) says he is the/a "symbole du lever du jour," though without specifying on what basis he claims this. It's true that Dadhikrā is compared to the sun at the end of the first hymn dedicated to him, IV.38.10, but that's not quite the same thing. Our pāda is also found in III.20.5, but as part of a longer list of divinities. For one possible reason for the inclusion of Dadhikrā here, see below ad vs. 11.

X.101.2: This vs. produces a plethora of images drawn from ordinarily life as comparanda for the priests' work. This skipping from image to image is anchored by the repetition of *-dhvam* noted above.

Ge (fld. by Re, HySpéc [but not EVP XVI], Don.) takes *dhíyaḥ* with the first verb: "Machet die Gedanken wohlgefällig." But this is grammatically impossible: *dhíyaḥ* is fem. acc. pl., and so neut. acc. pl. *mandrā́* cannot modify it (would need to be *mandrā́ḥ* in sandhi). I gather from his n. 2a that he takes *mandrā́ kṛ* as a phrasal verb, but positing such a construction requires more argumentation. Old points out that *mandrá-* and *dhī́-* are associated in IX.86.17, but I don't see that as a sufficient reason to contravene the syntax.

X.101.3–6: These four vss. fall into two pairs, with 4 essentially repeating 3(ab) and 6 repeating 5.

X.101.3: There's a common metaphorical connection in Vedic (and later) between sowing seed for crops and semen to impregnate a woman, but the metaphor usually goes the other way: the

furrow is the metaphor for the vagina. Here it's the vagina that's a metaphor for the furrow in an agricultural context. (Of course the whole thing is metaphorical for the priests' work.)

The second hemistich indirectly expresses the reciprocity that underlies the RVic ritual system: that the response to a praise hymn should be equal to it, though in material form.

The accent on *ásat* suggests that *ca* is subordinating; so the standard tr.

X.101.5: Note the rhyming heavy 2nd pl. active impvs. ending the first two pādas: *kṛṇotana ... dadhātana*.

As Ge (n. 5b) points out, these must be the cords attached to the buckets.

X.101.6: As was noted above, 6 is a version of 5, with the same lexical materials, scrambled and recombined.

X.101.7: The reason for the stress on the well in vss. 5–6 becomes clear here in the 2nd hemistich, where the features of the well are identified with parts of the soma apparatus in equational bahuvrīhis.

X.101.8: I don't quite understand why we should make a "pen" (*vrajám*) for soma: perhaps because if it provides drink, it must be like a cow and need a pen.

In d *vaḥ* was omitted from the tr. Correct to "your beaker."

X.101.9: The standard tr. (Ge, Re, Don, though see Ge n. 9 for possible alternative) are agreed that *dhíyam* here refers to the gods' thought. I think it must rather refer to *our* thought. The position of *vaḥ* immediately before *dhíyam* is of course not probative, since *vaḥ* is in standard Wackernagel's Position and can be construed with anything in the clause (including *ūtáye*, as Ge suggests in n. 9). The plural *dhíyaḥ* in 2a clearly referred to our thoughts. The image of the *dhī-* as a milk-yielding cow does not require her to be a creature from the gods. Instead she represents the usual reciprocity relationship (as seen also in 3cd): if our thought=cow pleases you gods, she will yield milk in the shape of material rewards from you.

On *duhīyāt* see comm. ad IV.41.5.

X.101.10: These images of the soma pressing need decoding. The "lap of wood" in pāda a is presumably the wooden cup. In b the publ. tr. takes the object also as the wooden cup, in part flg. an unpubl. paper by HPS. However, I now think (with Old) that the "axes of stone" (*vā́śībhiḥ ... aśmanváyībhiḥ*) are the pressing stones, based esp. on 7c *áśma-cakra-* 'whose wheel is the (pressing) stone'. Soma is then the object, and I would emend the tr. to "Fashion (it [=soma]) with axes made of stone."

The 10 girthbands are the fingers (so Old, Ge, Re [HSpéc]); cf. X.94.7 *dáśakakṣyebhyaḥ*, modifying the pressing stones. The object here should therefore also be the stones and not soma. So I would emend to "Embrace (them [=stones]) with ten girthbands." The two chariot poles in pāda are the hands and the draught horse the soma (so Old, Ge, Don for both identifications). I think this is probably right, but if *váhni-* is soma, it must be the soma *plant*, not the pressed juice, for the image to work, since juice can't be yoked to the implements that pressed it – even though the pressed juice is already referred to in pāda a. It is also possible that the two are the pressing stones.

X.101.11: As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn takes a surprisingly erotic turn at this point. Pāda a essentially repeats 10d, with *ubhé dhúrau váhniḥ* "the two chariot poles ... the draught horse"; again, I think the horse must be the soma plant and the chariot poles may be either the hands or the pressing stones. But an erotic simile is applied to this trio: a man, comparable to the draught horse, with two wives, comparable to the two chariot poles.

On *pibd-* see comm. ad VI.46.6 and EWA s.v. *PAD:* 'sich hin und her [auf den einen und anderen Fuss] fallen lassend, stampfend' citing Strunk and Gotō for this interpr. as an iterative. A stronger iterative sense would fit this sexual passage well, esp. give the two wives.

The *vánaspati-* is presumably soma, placed in the cup, but given the simile of b probably also the penis in the *yóni*.

The final pāda has two competing syntactic interpr. One, which is essentially universal in the standard tr., is that *útsam* is the obj. both of *ní ... dadhidhvam* and of the negated pres. part. *ákhanantaḥ* -- e.g., Don "sink the well deep without digging." The other, found in the publ. tr., is that the obj. of pāda c, *vánaspátim*, is the obj. of the main verb, with *útsam* obj. only of the participle. The reason for my interpr. is that *ní ... dadhidhvam* seems the logically next action after *ā́sthāpayadhvam* and should take the same object (see the next vs. for syntactic continuity), and the deeper foundation of the soma / deeper penetration of the penis is what is demanded. This can be effected without digging a well/spring. But since I don't really understand the image of the spring/well (and none of the tr. attempts to explain it), the standard view is not excluded.

Note that *dadhidhvam* is a near-rhyme with *dadhikrā́m* in the first vs. (1c), providing a sort of phonological ring composition, which might help account for the presence of that racehorse in this hymn.

X.101.12: Since the penis is the overt object of a set of 2nd pl. movement verbs, my interpr. of it as the object of *ní ... dadhidhvam* in 11d seems to gain some support.

It is hard not to be reminded here of the Sappho fragment "raise high the roofbeam, carpenters" (here filtered through the title of the J. D. Salinger novella) in a wedding context.

The feminine name (or nickname) *niṣṭigrī́-* is found only here. In context it is a designation of Indra's mother. The word is treated by Scar (112) and, at greater length, Remmer (*Frauennamen* 63–64), but the disc. doesn't get us very far.

X.102 Mudgala and Mudgalānī

For my general interpr. of this famous hymn, see the publ. intro. As I say there, I consider the hymn to be part of the under-the-surface debate in the late RV about the introduction of the ritual Patnī – in this case, very much in favor of this introduction, as she leads to victory and fertility. For disc. of this hymn in that context, see my 2018 "'Sacrificer's Wife' in the *Ṛgveda*: Ritual Innovation?" (*Creating the Veda, Living the Veda*, papers from 13th World Skt. Conf., ed. Brereton and Proferes, 19–30, esp. 23–25), also "The Secret Lives of Texts" (JAOS Pres. Address, JAOS 131 [2011], esp. 5–6) and, in earlier form, *SW/SW* (1996): 108–10.

It is striking that this hymn immediately follows the final, explicitly sexual vs. of the preceding hymn, X.101.12. In addition the "chariot pole" that figures in X.101.10, 11 is found here in vs. 10.

X.102.1: The speaker of the first vs. is taken by Ge (fld. by Don) as Mudgala; this seems reasonable. But this identification has further implications, given the enclitic pronouns *te* (a) and *naḥ* (d). Since Indra is in the 3rd ps. in this hemistich (b *índro avatu*), the *te* can only refer to

Mudgalānī, and it must identify the chariot as "yours" (namely, hers). The *naḥ* (Saṃhitā *no*) would then refer to the two of them or, perhaps, to their general household. If the former, the number is wrong – *unless* the form should really be dual **nau*, i.e., *nāv* in sandhi. As HvN point out in their metrical comm., "Exceptionally, -o in no should be scanned as long before a following vowel to avoid the uncommon cadence ⏑⏑⏑⏒." If the original enclitic was dual *nau*, however, this metrical license isn't necessary, since it would scan as *nāv* before vowel – and the sense is better as well. The tr. could be changed to "help *us two."

Most tr. render *mithūkṛ́tam* as 'wrongly made' vel sim.: e.g., Brereton 2002: 227 'wrongly used', Scarlatta (78) 'auf falsche Weise gefertigt, unbrauchbar', Ge 'vertauschten' (the lexeme *míthū kṛ* further glossed in n. 1ab as 'verwechseln, vertauschen, falsch, verkehrt machen'), Don 'perversely transformed' (resting, I think, on Ge). But the second member is not ppl. *kṛtá-* but the root noun *kṛ́t-*, and X-*kṛ́t-* compounds are always transitive or, at least, active in sense – not passive, as most tr. assume for this one. Scar indeed asserts that -*kṛ́t-* is passive here, and Ge clearly favors the passive interpr., though in the n. he allows for an active sense "Fehler machend, umschmeissend." In the publ. tr. I go with the passive interp. 'wrongly made' as one reading, but I would now substitute an active 'wrongly functioning'. In addition, and more important, I think this word is a pun, with *mithū* referencing *mithuná-* '(sexual) pair': "forming a sexual pair" looks forward to the successful sexual pairing effected by the chariot race.

Vs. 3 of the Agastya–Lopāmudrā hymn, which also treats fraught gender relations, also contains both *mithuná-* and *ājí-*.

X.102.2: In her first appearance in the hymn (save for, probably, the ungendered *te* in 1a), Mudgalānī appears both as a victorious charioteer and as a highly sexualized female. The wind whipping up her dress in pāda a reminds us of the many Apsarases in the epic who seduce ascetics through the judicious application of a breeze to their filmy garments.

At least in this hymn *sma* + present seems to have the function of a past iterative / durative; see also 4b *sma ... eti* and 6d *ṛchánti ṣma*.

On the dicing idiom *kṛtáṃ ví √ci*, see comm. ad X.42.9.

X.102.3: This vs. is in Bṛhatī, like the first and final (12) vss. of the hymn, unlike the Triṣṭubh of the rest. It also has nothing to do with the specifics of the hymn, being a conventional plea to Indra for help in combat. (Vss. 1 and 12 are also somewhat distant from the hymn in sense, but closer than this one.) I do not know why this intrusive vs. is found here; it actually disrupts the depiction of the race and introduces an incongruous scene of general warfare.

On *abhi √dās*, see Narten (Sig. Aor. 140; also KZ 78: 56ff.). She considers it a secondary root, based on an *s*-aor. subjunctive.

It is worth noting (but probably not pursuing) that Indra is asked to parry his own signature weapon, the *vájra*, presumably in the hands of another; the *vadhá-* in d that he is asked to keep away is also often his. (This issue is also raised by Don, n. 6.) It would be possible to take the participles as abl. and tr. "hold back (your) *vájra* from the assailant ..." But this doesn't entirely help, since you'd think Indra would want to smite him, not spare him.

X.102.4: The bull that is one of the yoked team that Mudgalānī controls makes its appearance.

The stem *kū́ṭa-* is rare to non-existent in Skt. outside of this passage (see Ge n. 4b, EWA s.v.; the interpr. owing to Neisser), but is found in Pāli as a word for 'hammer' (*kūṭa*[3] in Cone, Dict. of Pāli; see also *aya-kūṭa-*). It seems likely (to me) to be a specialization of *kūṭa*[1] 'a

prominence or projection; a horn; a summit, a peak'. Here it seems to be used as a nickname for the bull, characterizing its assaultive intensity and persistence. For a similar nickname, cf. Matt "the Hammer" Hamill, a "mixed marital artist and wrestler," whose profile is available on the web.

Ge suggests (n. 4b) that *tṛṃhát ... eti* is almost a periphrastic. Although I am generally sympathetic to periphrastic analyses, in this case I think *eti* should be interpr. as a full lexical verb, with *sma* (on which see comm. ad vs. 2), meaning "kept going" – that is, nothing kept him from running the full race.

tṛṃhát is the only form of the nasal infix pres. in RV, but it is robustly attested in the AV (both Ś and P). *Pace* Gr, the expected form here is not **tṛṃhán*, since neut. *kū́ṭam* is the subject.

X.102.5: The first hemistich describes the efforts of the opponents/competitors to check the progress of the bull – against which, as we saw in 4b, he "kept going." As Ge (n. 5ab) and Don (n. 8) point out, the animal would be forced to stop either to roar or to piss.

X.102.6: The form *kakárdave* is a hapax and has received a variety of interpr. Gr takes it as dat. to a -*u*-stem meaning "der Knurren in den Eingeweiden" (rumbling in the guts), Ge as loc. to an -*a*-stem, an onomatopoetic word for the cart or its shaft. Old dithers around these various possibilities, but suggests that it is best to leave the word unerklärt, an opinion apparently shared by EWA (s.v.). (Don tr. it as a verb ["rumbled"], with Gr's semantics, but no indication of how she sees the morphology.) I am strongly drawn to, and in fact persuaded by, a suggestion of Dumézil's (*Nouvelle Clio*, 1953: 261–62; repeated and rediscussed in *Mariages indo-européens* 1979: 282ff., esp. 288–89), reported by Re (ÉVP XVI ad loc.). Dumézil suggests that the word contains the cross-linguistically common nursery word *kaka* for excrement. As for the rest of the form, he half-heartedly suggests that roots or enlargements containing the phonological sequence -*ard* are "fréquents dans cette zone sémantique" (1953: 262 = 1979: 289 n. 1), a rather hazy explanation. I suggest rather that it contains a form of the root √*ṛd* 'shake (out), scatter, spray', a *u*-stem *-*ṛdu*-. As Dumézil points out, this interpr. of a dat. *kakárdave* as "ut stercus faceret" fits well not only with the companion verb *amehayan* 'made piss' in 5b but also with the droppings that hit Mudgalānī in 6d. I construe this dative with *yuktáḥ* 'yoked' in the sense of 'employed, set to the task', since I see this startling image – of the bull droppings hitting Mudgalānī as she drives – in this middle vs. of the hymn as establishing a perverse type of sexual contact between bull and woman, which sets up her gaining of fertility at the end of the hymn.

The apparent intensive *ávāvacīt* is found only here, and is ordinarily assigned to the root √*vac* 'speak', but I think it makes much more sense to assign it to √*vañc* 'move crookedly'. Ge (n. 6b) explicitly rejects Roth's suggestion to this effect, as does Schaeffer (Intens. 176–77; she tr. "redete unaufhörlich," which at least fits the context better than Ge's simple "schrie"). Schaeffer asserts that roots of the shape K*e*RK always have the R represented in intensive redupl., and we should therefore expect ***vaṃvañc*-, which could later be replaced by the grammarians' *vanīvañc*-. I don't consider intensive redupl. to be as well regulated as she claims, and in particular the ambiguity of long-redupl. perfects like *rārandh*- (with impv. *rārandhí* VI.25.9), interpr. by many as an intens., would allow the nonce creation of an intens. stem *vāvac*- to √*vañc* here. Such a root assignment fits the context much better: Mudgalānī keeps dodging the bull's turds, but unsuccessfully. Rendering it as crying out or speaking incessantly adds nothing to the passage.

The nom. phrase *sā́rathiḥ … keśī́* "long-haired charioteer" should be masc. In its other occurrences *sā́rathi-* has masc. reference and inflects as a standard short-*i* masc., and feminines to *-ín*-stems are in *-ín-ī-* (see, in fact, fem. pl. *keśínīḥ* 2x), not *-ī́*. However, the gender-ambiguous *vṛkī*-form *rathī́ḥ* in 2c, used of Mudgalānī, has prepared the way for a fem. interpr. of *sā́rathiḥ* here, and of course the nom. sg. *keśī́* looks like a nom. sg. to a *devī́*-type fem. Ge (n. 6b) and Don (n. 10) claim that the long hair identifies the subject as a woman, but since masc. *keśín-* is used a number of times of male munis (ascetics) in X.136, this claim is not straightforward.

In c "bull" should be in parens, since it doesn't appear in the Skt.

The appearance of *ánas-* 'cart, wagon' is a bit surprising, since the vehicle in this hymn is otherwise called a chariot (*rátha-* 1a) and its driver a charioteer (*rathī́-* 2c, *sā́rathi-* 6b).

The adjacency of *niṣpádo mudgalā́nīm* "the droppings Mudgalānī" is nicely iconic, since the droppings do in fact touch the woman.

X.102.7–8: These vss. depict the yoking of the ill-assorted pair, the bull (vs. 7) and the piece of wood (vs. 8), as the team for the race. It is not initially clear if this yoking actually precedes the headlong race described in vss. 4–5 or whether this represents a new stage in the proceedings. My surmise is the former – that is, as in other RVic narratives the events have been scrambled and some episodes are duplicated. The first description of the race in vss. 4–5 simply omits mention of the piece of wood, while in vss. 7–10 the full measure of the accomplishment – a victory despite a faulty team – is emphasized. One of my reasons for thinking this is that Mudgala's win is described in almost identical terms in 5cd and 9cd:

5cd *téna … śatávat sahásraṃ, gávām múdgalaḥ … jigāya*

9cd *yéna jigā́ya śatávat sahásraṃ, gávām múdgalaḥ …*

This near-identity suggests that the two statements are summarizing the same event.

X.102.7: The word *pradhí-* seems to refer to a part of a wheel that can come in segments (see I.164.48, IV.30.5 for explicitly numbered *pradhí-* and II.39.4 for dual *pradhī́*). Scar (267) lists it with other *-dhí-* compounds but makes no further remarks. Ge (n. 7a) thinks it refers the wheel-rim (Radkranz, like "later" *nemí-* [though *nemí-* is well attested already in the core RV]), constructed of boards/planks (Brettern). This doesn't seem like it would produce a smoothly running and swift chariot, but I don't know enough about archaic wheel construction to judge. Nonetheless, I would think it referred to some part of the wheel that didn't have contact with the ground.

The publ. tr. contains an awkward doubling of the word 'bull' – representing both *váṃsaga-* in b and *kakúdmant-* in d. The rendering of the latter should be corrected to "humpbacked (bull)," with bull in parens. The full phrase is found in X.8.2 *vṛṣabháḥ kakúdmān*. The prior term *váṃsaga-* is more problematic. Don tr. 'steer' and (n. 13) identifies it as "the castrated bull," as a metaphor for the wooden club yoked and contrasted with the virile bull, the "husband of the cows" in pāda c. I think she may have been hastily misled by German "Stier" (Gr's gloss and Ge's tr. of *váṃsaga-*), which is not the direct semantic equivalent of English "steer," but refers more generally to bulls. And certainly elsewhere *váṃsaga-* is compared to a *vṛ́ṣan-* (I.7.8). Moreover, Indra himself is compared to a *váṃsaga-* (e.g., I.55.1, 130.2, VIII.33.2), and it seems unlikely that the super-virile Indra would regularly be compared to a castrated animal. The virility of the animal is suggested by, e.g., X.144.3, where it is found "among his own females" (*āsú svā́su*). I tr. the word as 'buffalo' sometimes elsewhere, in part following EWA's gloss 'Stier, Büffelbulle' and in part because some of the behavior of the *váṃsaga* seems

like that of a wild animal: sharpening its horns (I.55.1, VI.16.39) and thirstily approaching to drink (I.130.2, V.36.1, VIII.33.2). Esp. telling are V.36.1, where the thirsty animal is *dhanvacará-* 'roaming the waste places', and VIII.33.2, where the thirsty animal is 'following its own track' (*svabdín-*, on which see comm. ad loc.). In any case in our vs. I think there is only one male bovine at issue – the virile bull, yoked by Indra.

X.102.8: To harmonize with the other occurrences of *áṣṭrā-* (IV.57.4, VI.53.9, 57.2), I would change the tr. of *aṣṭrāvín-* to 'goad in hand'. The subject is probably Mudgala, though the goad and the *kaparda-* hairstyle are also characteristic of Pūṣan, as Old points out (see also Ge n. 8ab and Don n. 14).

The goad and strap also appear in the agricultural hymn IV.57.4 in conjunction with *śunám*: *śunáṃ varatrā̆ badhyantāṃ, śunám áṣṭrām úd iṅgaya* "For prosperity let the straps be bound; for prosperity brandish the goad." In that vs. I take *śunám* as an adverbial acc.; here I construe it with *acarat* "achieved prosperity," more lit. "practiced / proceeded to." It would be possible to take *acarat* as a (quasi-)aux. with *ānáhyamānaḥ* "continued to / kept binding," but I think the point here is that the binding needs to be done quickly and efficiently.

As for *varatrā̆-* 'strap', see X.60.8, where a yoke is tied with a *varatrā̆-*.

In IV.22.9 I tr. *kṛṇuhi ... nṛmṇā̆ni* as "activate your manly powers," arguing (comm. ad loc.) that *nṛmṇá-* does not refer to manly deeds but the abstract powers that allow these deeds to be performed. Such an interpr. works better here as well, since the yoking just performed makes it possible for the chariot victory to be achieved. This is directly expressed by the end of d *táviṣīr adhatta* "he assumed his powers." I would therefore emend the tr. to "activating his manly abilities."

I am not sure who the "many folk" (*bahú- jána-*) are or why they are the beneficiaries of this action. Quite possibly the spectators, who will speak the next vss. (9–10).

I am in agreement with Ge (n. 8cd) and Don that the subject in the 2nd hemistich changes to the bull.

X.102.9–10: These two vss. are the direct speech of the spectators watching the unexpected victory. So also, e.g., Ge and Don. They in fact include vs. 11 in this direct speech section, but I consider it a summary vs. and the "moral" of the hymn.

X.102.9: On the root noun *yúj-* and the "strong" forms *yúñjam* (here) and du. *yúñjā* (I.162.21) see Schindler (Rt noun s.v.), who takes these forms as secondarily strengthened on the model of paradigms like *sánt- / sát-*, with the weak pres. stem *yuñj-* as the basis. Our form occurs at the end of a Triṣṭubh line, where the ordinary acc. sg. *yújam* wouldn't fit; *yújam* is fairly common in the iambic cadence of dimeter lines – see in fact 12d. As for dual *yúñjā*, its metrical position also favors a heavy syllable; see comm. ad loc.

The position of the wooden club is expressed in phraseology very similar to that of Vṛtra after his smiting in the famous Indra-Vṛtra hymn, I.32.10: *kā̆ṣṭhānām mádhye níhitaṃ śárīram* "his body sunk down in the middle of the race courses" versus our *kā̆ṣṭhāyā mádhye drughaṇáṃ śáyānam*. Although that particular pāda in I.32 does not have a form of √*śi* 'lie', it is the signature verb of that section of the hymn and our *śáyānam* may be meant to recall the larger context. I find it hard not to interpret the expression here as a direct echo of that well-known hymn.

On the second hemistich, see comm. ad 7–8 above.

X.102.10: With others, I consider this vs. to concern the wooden club, which was also the focus of attention in vs. 9. However, I think the club is assimilated to Mudgala, who (in my view) has been impotent and inert like a piece of wood. But just as the club has pulled off an improbable victory in the race, so Mudgala has (re)gained his potency. The key to this interpr. is pāda b, with the verb *ā́ sthāpayanti* "they make mount." On the one hand, as Ge (n. 10) suggests, after the race the bystanders just pick up the club and put it on the cart – as opposed to its yokemate, the bull, who will be fed, watered, and possibly allowed access to the waiting cows. On the other hand, 'mount' can be meant sexually (see the use of *ā́sthāpayadhvam* in the immed. preceding hymn, X.101.11), and so we can infer that Mudgala has recovered his sexual powers and can mount his wife. The negatively viewed excreta of vss. 5–6 have been, in some sense, transformed into positive sexuality, as is even clearer in vs. 11.

The apparent non sequitur of the last pāda, with "the higher end of the chariot pole" (*úttaro dhuráḥ*), is, again in my view, a reference to the new ritual model with the Sacrificer's Patnī. As disc. in my 2018 art. cited above (22–25), the chariot pole, with one side slightly higher, is a metaphor for the new ritual pairing, with husband and wife both yoked to the same pole, but his side somewhat higher. In our vs. the husband's (/wooden club's) side is given a slight edge, but an almost equal yoking is necessary for the chariot to go forward.

X.102.11: As noted above, although Ge (/Don) consider this vs. part of the spectators' reactive direct speech, I take it instead as a summary of the successful outcome of the race: the recovery of the fertility of both Mudgala and Mudgalānī (and, by extension, the success of the new ritual model). It is in essence the last vs. of the hymn narrative, since vs. 12 is in a different meter and celebrates Indra. The 1st person speakers of the second hemistich of vs. 11 are not the narrative-internal spectators but the ritual officiants who have recited the hymn and express their hope for similar success from their ritual performance. The "charioteer" (*rathī́-*) in c is a metaphorical reference to the ritual Patnī, identified with Mudgalānī, the charioteer(ess) in the narrative just recounted.

On the "Avoided Wife" (*parivṛktā́*) esp. in the later ritual lit. (there usually *parivṛktī́*), see my *SW/SW* 99–110. One likely reason she is "avoided" is that she has failed to have children (/sons), and here she recovers her husband by "swelling" – that is, lactating as a consequence of birth (and indeed swelling with pregnancy itself) -- itself a consequence of his "dripping" with semen, as a sign of the recovery of his potency. The dripping is in turn a sort of transformation of the bull's pissing in vs. 4. Ge (n. 11b, with his tr. fld. by Don) considers masculine *siñcán* as a substitute for fem. *siñcántī* at pāda-end, so that she would be both swelling and dripping. But the image of both members of the married couple exuding fertile fluid is surely stronger than assigning it only to her, and a poet capable of composing this complex hymn could surely have found a way to incorporate the fem. part. *siñcántī* had he intended that form.

The "poor (water) wheel" is presumably a little deprecatory joke.

The hapax *eṣaiṣī́-* has been variously analyzed; see some of the possibilities laid out by Old. I follow Old and Ge (n. 11c) in taking it as built to an adj. **eṣá-* 'swift', which has been doubled to produce a colloquial emphatic: 'super-swift, swifter than swift'. A very similar formation is found in the next hymn, X.103.1 *ghanāghaná-* 'smiting again and again'. The *-ī́-* fem. is due to matching that of *rathī́-* (so Old).

On *sína-* see comm. ad II.30.2, where I suggest 'gear' as a gloss. In *sínavant-* here I think it refers to material winnings, in contrast to non-material *sumaṅgála-* 'bringing good luck'.

X.102.12: As noted previously, this vs. is in Bṛhatī, like the 1st vs. and vs. 3. It celebrates Indra, who engineered the victory of Mudgala and Mudgalānī. The first hemistich is generic – and somewhat off-kilter -- praise of the god: why is Indra called "the eye of the world"? The second half briskly summarizes the point of the hymn narrative – particularly the yoking of a virile bull with a impotent castrate – though without the telling details. Although Ge (fld. by Don) takes Mudgala to be the speaker, I see no reason for this assignment.

I follow Old and Ge (n. 12cd) in taking *vṛ́ṣaṇā* as an irregularly distracted instr. sg. (beside *vṛ́ṣṇā* 2x), not a dual. One of the two occurrences of *vṛ́ṣṇā* is in fact in the next hymn, X.103.2, and (faulty) distraction is possible there too. Though most of X.103 is in Triṣṭubh and the form is in a good Triṣṭubh cadence (... *-hastena vṛ́ṣṇā*), two of the three other pāda in this vs. are actually Jagatīs with the cadences *jiṣṇúnā* (a) and *dhṛṣṇúnā* (b), so **vṛ́ṣanā* (d) would be possible (though producing a light antepenult); a similar faulty distraction would also be possible in c: *sahadh(ᵘ)vam*.

X.103 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., there is considerable lexical chaining in the hymn.

This hymn has several features reminiscent of the previous one; see comments esp. to vss. 1 and 2.

X.103.1: The passages collected by Ge (n. 1a) make it clear that "horns" should be supplied in the simile. Ge also supplies "weapons" as object in the frame, while I take the participle simply as reflexive. Ge's addition is certainly possible.

As noted ad X.102.11, the hapax double cmpd here *ghanāghaná-* 'smiting and smiting, smiting again and again' is constructed like *eṣaiṣṭ-* in X.102.11, if the latter's analysis as *eṣa-eṣá- / -ṭ* is correct. Note also that the base *ghaná-* is found in the unique cmpd *dru-ghaná-* 'wooden club', which in X.102.9 is yoked with the bull for Mudgalānī's chariot race.

Although *saṃkrándana-* is glossed as intrans. (Gr 'brüllend'; Ge's "Heerrufer" is ambig.), *-ana*-nominals ordinarily pattern with *-áya*-verbs and have transitive value; see in fact *kṣóbhana-* in the preceding pāda. Here I supply as its obj. the *carṣaṇí-* that is construed with *kṣóbhana-* in b.

X.103.2: The already heavy phrase *saṃkrándano 'nimiṣáḥ* of 1b becomes even more so in its instr. transformation *saṃkrándanenānimiṣéṇa* in 2a. The lexical chaining is initiated with a bang! Note that this transformation eliminates the caesura in this pāda (as HvN point out), a lack that would focus even more attention on the heavy phrase.

Note the rhyming and morphologically parallel finals of the first two pādas: ... *jiṣṇúnā* # (a), ... *dhṛṣṇúnā* # (b). This figure would draw attention to the fact that these two pādas are Jagatīs in an otherwise Triṣṭubh hymn (save for the final vs. 13: Anuṣṭubh). As noted ad X.102.12, one of the two occurrences of instr. sg. *vṛ́ṣṇā* is found at the end of our d, in contrast to distracted *vṛ́ṣaṇā* in X.102.12. I suggest there that the *vṛ́ṣṇā* here could possibly be read distracted, given the Jagatī cadences of the first two pādas of the vs. Of course, this would produce a bad cadence, with light antepenult, but I think it's possible that the distraction possibility was lurking in the background – esp. since the final of c, *sahadhvam*, could also be read *sahadhᵘvam*, with the same light antepenult, but a match to the Jagatī cadence of a and b.

The string of *-ana*-forms continues with *duś-cyavana-*. The transitive value of *cyávana-* is maintained, but with the modified nominal as obj. not subj.

X.103.3: The most salient ex. of lexical chaining is *íṣuhastaiḥ* picking up *íṣuhastena* in 2d, but *yúdhaḥ* in b matches *yúdhaḥ* in 2d (and *yut-* in *yutkāréṇa* in 2b). There is internal chaining between the forms of *sám* √*sṛj* in b and c: agent noun *sáṃsraṣṭā* and ppl. *saṃsṛṣṭa-jít-*.

The tr. of *vaśī* as 'willful' is misleading; I'd now substitute 'exerting his will / who exerts his will'.

X.103.4: No chaining between 3 and 4, save for *yudhā* in c picking up the various *yudh-* forms in 2 and 3. The intrusion of Bṛhaspati is surprising; even as an alloform of Indra, he is not usually excessively martial, but he certainly is here. HPS (B+I 100) suggests that Bṛhaspati is here Indra's Hauptpriester and his charioteer, reciting Zaubersprüche. But the vs. shows him in a more physically active role than that of priest; vs. 8 ties him more directly to ritual activity.

The phrase in pāda a *pári dīyā ráthena* is addressed to Parjanya in V.83.7, where it makes more sense. As Ge (n. 4d) points out, pāda d is almost identical to VII.32.11c, addressed to Indra. This Bṛhaspati vs. seems to have been assembled from spare parts.

X.103.5: This vs. returns to Indra and modulates through a series of phonological and etymological figures: *sthávirаḥ právīraḥ ... / abhívīraḥ* ➔*abhívīro abhísatvā*; *sáhasvān ... sáhamāna(ḥ) ... / ... sahojā*.

právīra-, *abhívīra-*, *abhísatvan-* are found only here in the RV and so their preverbal prefixes must meaningfully contrast.

X.103.6: After a few vss. without chaining, this vs. has numerous echoes in what precedes: *gotrabhídaṃ govídam* opening pāda a picks up the *go-* of *govít*, which ends 5d: in fact, of course, *govit* and *govídam* belong to the same stem, and *gotrabhídaṃ govídam* also rhyme. Still in pāda a, *vájrabāhum* picks up *bāhuśardhī* in 3c; *jáyantam* in b *jáyan* in 4c; *pramṛṇántam* in b *pramṛṇáḥ* in 4c; and in c *vīrayadhvam* echoes *právīraḥ .... abhívīraḥ* in 5a, c.

In d "Indra" should be substituted for "him," an oversight in the publ. tr.

X.103.7: This vs. is a veritable "greatest hits" of the hymn so far: *gotrá-* (see *gotra-bhíd-* 6a); *sáhasā* and (*pṛtanā-)ṣā́ṭ* (see √*sah* forms in 5, also 2c); *vīráḥ* (see 5 and 6); *duścyavaná-* (2b); *ayudhyáḥ* and *yutsú* (various *yudh* forms: 2b, 2d, 3b, 4c, *sénā-* (1d, 4c), *avatu* (4d).

X.103.8: As noted above ad vs. 4, Bṛhaspati is here in a priestly (as well as martial) context.

In c √*bhañj* (*abhibhañjatīnā́m*), *sénā-* (*devasenā́nām*), and √*ji* (*jáyantīnām*) recur from 4c *prabhañján sénāh ... jáyan*, but in vs. 4 the *sénāḥ* were objects of √*bhañj* and √*ji*, whereas here it is the armies themselves that do the shattering and conquering. This is typical of the shifting use of the repeated lexical items in this hymn.

The Maruts make their first appearance here.

X.103.9: The Maruts recur here, and Varuṇa and the Ādityas are introduced. The pres. part. *jáyant-* is found again (see vss. 4 and 8).

The cmpd. *bhuvana-cyavā́nām* echoes *duś-cyavaná-* (2b, 7c), but the echo *-ā́nām* / *-aná-* is morphologically misleading, since *-cyavā́nām* is the gen. pl. of *-cyavá-*.

X.103.10: The vs. is structured by the *úd* opening all four pādas. The first is construed with the 2nd sg. impv. *(d)harṣaya* (√*hṛṣ*) in pāda a, the last with the 3rd pl. impv. *yantu*. Since the nouns in b and c are neut. pl., they can either be objects of the verb in pāda a or subjects of the verb in d. I chose the former (as did Ge), but the latter is not impossible.

More repetitions: *sátvan-* (5c *abhí-satvan-*), *mánas-* (9c *mahā́-manasām*, which partly overlaps with *māmakā́nām* preceding *mánāṃsi* here); *rátha-* (4a, 4d, 5d), *jáyant-* (4b, 8d, 9d), *ghóṣa-* (9d).

The peculiar deriv. *māmaká-* of the gen. sg. 1st ps. pronoun *máma* is striking. It is curious to find this diminutive/deprecatory type of formation in this highly martial context. Perhaps the tone is one of proprietary affection.

X.103.11: Like vs. 10, this vs. has identical openings to all four pādas, the emphatic 1st pl. pronoun, with a slight variation in the final pāda: acc. *asmā́n* instead of gen. *asmā́kam*.

With Gr (and implicitly Ge) I take *úttare* as a nom. pl. with pronominal inflection (as elsewhere).

The *úttara-* chains with the pāda-opening *ud*-s of vs. 10, while the pāda-openings '(of) us' can be seen as chaining semantically with *māmakā́nām* of 10b.

X.103.12: On *apvā́-* see EWA s.v. and esp. KH (Aufs. 52–57). It is found also in AVŚ IX.8.9, as well as AVŚ III.2.5 = AVP III.5.5, which are variants of our vs.

X.104 Indra

As indicated in the publ. intro., this hymn, attributed to a Vaiśvāmitra, ends with the Viśvāmitra refrain common in Maṇḍala III, and it has an almost self-consciously old-fashioned well-made air. Like the preceding hymn (X.103) there is a fair amount of chaining between vss.

X.104.1: The dat. prn. *túbhyam* both ends pāda a and begins pāda c; in between pāda b ends with the rhyme form *tū́yam*. Pāda-final *túbhyam* recurs in 2c and 3b.

On the curious bahuv. *vípra-vīra-* see comm. ad IX.44.5. The sense presumably is that the creators of ritual speech are just as heroic as more martial men. Note also that the verb *dadhan<u>vira</u>* (in sandhi) in the next pāda echoes *vípra<u>vīrā</u>* (also in sandhi) with shortened vowels.

X.104.2: Ge construes gen. *sutásya* with *jaṭháram pṛṇasva* "fill your belly with the pressed (soma)," and it is conceivable that √*pṛ* 'fill' could take a partitive genitive. However it ordinarily takes the instr., and it seems better here to take *nṛ́bhiḥ sutásya* in b as parallel with *apsú dhūtásya* in pāda a. That in IX.62.5 (cited by Ge n. 2ab) *apsú dhūtó nṛ́bhiḥ sutáḥ* is a single phrase supports this analysis. Another passage containing *jaṭháraṃ* √*pṛ* with a potential gen. is found in VI.69.7 *sómasya ... jaṭháram pṛṇethām*, where Gr and Ge both construe the gen. with *pṛṇethām*. However there as well the gen. is better taken with the preceding verb: *píbatam mádhvo asyá, sómasya ...*, like our *píba*. The fact that the preceding vs. in this hymn ends with the short exhortative clause *píbā sutásya* provides addition support for a syntagm *píba ... sútasya* here.

I take *jaṭháram pṛṇasva* as a brief parenthetic clause, rather like the *píbā sutásya* that ends the previous vs. (1d). The rel. clause in c then hangs off the genitive complements of *píba* in pāda a.

The root affiliation of the verb *mimikṣúḥ* in c is unclear. Gr takes it as the pf. to the desid. of √*mih* 'ausgiessen, pissen', with the developed sense 'reichlich zuströmen'. Ge tr. "schmackhaft gemacht haben" (root affiliation?). Kü (387) takes it to √*myakṣ* 'attach, be attached' but in an unusual constr., tr. "Den bei sich halten die Presssteine, Indra für dich ...," which satisfies neither syntactically nor semantically, though it accounts for the *-ṣ*. Somewhat daringly, I take it as belonging semantically to √*mih* 'piss', but after the roots *mih*, *myakṣ*, and **miś* ('mix') had become hopelessly confused. My 'trickle' is a semantic development of 'piss'.

The pl. *tébhiḥ* in d has no clear referent, but it probably refers to plural soma drinks; as Old points out, the soma described in pādas a, b, and c could almost be taken as three different somas.

X.104.3: On *prayaí*, see Keydana (Inf. 201–2), who denies that it's, technically, a real infinitive. Nonetheless, it might as well be. Moreover, he bases his decision on the fact that the subject of the putative inf. would fill the recipient role in the matrix clause, but I think it's possible, and so tr., that the expression of the recipient is limited to *vṛ́ṣṇe* in pāda a, with *túbhyam* in b reserved as subj. of *prayaí*.

On *dhénā-* as 'nourishing stream', see comm. ad I.2.3. Ge's "an den Reden" relies on an out-of-date interpr. of the word. Instead, cd indicates that Indra is receiving both soma and verbal praise.

The tr. of *śácyā* as 'ably' in d was conditioned by its chaining with *śacīvaḥ* in the next pāda, 4b. Another ex. of chaining: *sutásya* in b repeats the same in 2b (and 1d).

X.104.4: The phrase "in the house/dwelling of Manu" (*mánuṣo duroṇé*) is found four times elsewhere (VII.70.2, VIII.87.2=X.40.13, X.110.1), three times in Aśvin hymns, once in an Āprī hymn in a Jātavedas vs. (X.110.1), and here in an Indra hymn. It is always in a ritual context and presumably refers to the ritual ground.

Act. *gṛṇántaḥ* contrasts with passive *gṛṇānáḥ* in the previous vs., 3d; as just noted *śacīvaḥ* (a) chains with *śácyā* in 3d.

X.104.5: This vs. is essentially a continuation of vs. 4, with Indra's praisers as subject, achieving their goals through Indra's aid. The vs. lacks a finite verb; I take the participle *dádhānāḥ* as predicated.

The participial phrase *ūtím ... dádhānāḥ* echoes *váyo dádhānāḥ* in 4b. Another echo is furnished by the vs. opening *práṇītibhiṣ ṭe haryaśva* (5a), which matches 4a *ūtī́ śacīvas táva* in structure: INSTR *te* VOC (5a) : INSTR VOC *táva* (4a). Here the *te* is expanded with a series of genitives, *suṣṭóḥ ... suṣumnásya pururúcaḥ*. The opening instr. is matched by *sūnṛ́tābhiḥ* at the end of the vs. And *ūtī́* of 4a is repeated as *ūtím* in c.

The form *suṣṭóḥ* has caused much consternation, summarized in brief by Scar (637). Since a root noun cmpd *suṣṭú-* would be ill-formed, lacking the stem-final *-t* expected for roots in short resonants (like *-stú-t-* itself), another analysis is required. Re's 1937 suggestion (reported by Scar) that it belongs to a stem **su-ṣṭótu-* 'praiseworthy', whose gen. **suṣṭotoḥ* underwent haplology, is appealing, if not definitive.

X.104.6: The banal first hemistich packs in a lot of echoes from earlier in the hymn: *harivo hárībhyām* picks up *háribhyām* (1b) and *harivaḥ* (2a), not to mention *haryaśva* (3b, 5a); *sutásya*

is also found in 1d, 2b, 3b; *úpa ... yāhi* = *úpa yāhi* (1b) as well as *prayaí* (3b); *pītáye* recalls *pītím* (3a); *sómasya* = *sómaḥ* (1). Only *bráhmāṇi* is new.

The second hemistich shakes things up a bit. In pāda c it is striking that the sacrifice goes to Indra, not vice versa (as in 1a *yajñám úpa yāhi*), and that (at least in my interpr.) Indra has been patiently waiting for it (*kṣámamāṇam*) – not a characteristic Indraic trait! (Ge's der Nachsichtigen ["indulgent, forgiving"] is hardly more Indraic.)

Then in d Indra is called both "pious" (*dāśvā́n*) and "the visible sign of the rite" (*adhvarásya praketáḥ*). To treat the second anomaly first: this description is far better suited to Agni, and is in fact applied to him in a pāda almost identical to this one: VII.11.1 *mahā́m̐ asy adhvarásya praketáḥ* (cf. also III.8.8 ... *adhvarásya ketúm* also of Agni, and other similar expressions). It is of course possible to construct a rationale for using this phrase of Indra: his presence at the sacrifice is the sign that it is actually proceeding. But the change of referent is jarring nonetheless.

As for *dāśváṃs-*, this very well-attested stem is used overwhelmingly of mortal worshipers, but here it must modify Indra. Gr gives a handful of passages where it modifies divinities: gods I.3.7, Savitar I.110.5, and esp. Varuṇa X.65.5, 6, X.113.5 in the pāda-final formula *váruṇāya dāśúṣe*. Given Varuṇa's ethical proclivities, "pious" fits him rather better than the freewheeling Indra, and in X.65.5–6, as I say there (comm. ad loc.), the hymn has a tendency to attribute human ritual roles to gods. For I.3.7 and I.110.5 see comm. ad locc. Ge simply ignores the usual sense of *dāśváṃs-* and tr. "der Freigebige." There is no note on the passage, so I don't know if he thought that this sense was possible for *dāśváṃs-* or if he misread the word as *dā́svān* 'rich in gifts' (or thought a pun on that form was intended -- which is certainly possible).

The cluster of un-Indra-like characteristics in this hemistich seems intended to jar the audience out of the complacency fostered by the standard tropes that have dominated the hymn so far (and will return).

X.104.7: As in a few other places, *suvṛktí-* is a secondary bahuvr. referring to the recipient of "well-twisted" hymns, not the hymns themselves. See comm. ad II.4.1. It is used of Indra in X.74.5. For an exactly similar usage, see *suśastí-* in 10a.

In the face of near-universal agreement that *namasyā́* is underlyingly *namasyā́ḥ* and a nom. pl. (Pp., Gr, Ge), Old points out that desid. substantives in *-yā́* do not form plurals and are normally adverbial frozen instr. sg. -- though he allows as how the instr. sg. would produce a less natural ("minder natürliche") construction here. Nonetheless, I find an instr. perfectly acceptable semantically and much more likely morphologically: the singer produces the songs with a desire to do homage.

X.104.8–10: After seven relatively banal vss. about Indra's journey to the sacrifice and the predictable delights that await him there, the last three vss. (before the Viśvāmitra clan refrain, vs. 11) concern Indra's exploits, esp. the Vṛtra battle.

X.104.8: An unobtrusive chaining connects this narrative vs. with the ritual one(s) preceding: 7b *suté-raṇam* : 8a *su-ráṇā(ḥ)*.

I am puzzled by the instr. *yā́bhiḥ* in b, referring to the seven divine waters of pāda a. In Ge's tr. and in the publ. tr., it seems to portray the seven divine waters as the instruments by which Indra crossed the *síndhu*, but this makes no sense. Lü (132–34) shares my puzzlement, but I do not find his solution any more satisfactory than Ge's: he (re-)interpr. *síndhu-* as 'Meere' and

√*tṝ* as 'durchdringen', with the seven waters of pāda a the waters freed in the Vṛtra battle. (Pāda c then gets construed with d, with the 99 streams constituting the *gātú-* that Indra produced for the gods and Manu.) There is a simpler solution: to take *yā́bhiḥ* as an instr. of accompaniment, to be construed with *síndhum*. In other words, Indra crossed the *síndhu* along with / in addition to the seven divine waters (presumably, indeed, the *saptá síndhavaḥ*). This goes somewhat awkwardly into English, but is perfectly compatible with the Sanskrit. I would now emend the tr. to "Seven are the divine waters ... along with / in addition to them you ... crossed the boundary river ..." The 99 streams in c are then additional riverine barriers to cross.

X.104.9: Ge takes *cakártha* in c as a gaming term and tr. "Die du ... gewonnen hast." But though terms like *kṛtá* and *kārá* (see his n. 9c) do have such senses, I do not know of other exx. of the bare finite verb being so used. I take the verb in its standard sense, and think it probably means that in freeing the waters he actualized them, as it were – made them really exist. It's also possible that √*kṛ* is a dummy verb or with a gapped infinitive, in the sense 'made/let flow', but in the absence of anything in the context that encourages this interpr. and of any parallel expressions elsewhere, this seems less likely.

X.104.10: The first word of the vs., *vīréṇya-*, has attracted more disc. than I think it deserves; see Old's and Ge's (n.10a) treatments, both referring to Bloomfield, who thinks that the phrase *vīréṇyaḥ krátuḥ* stands for the cmpd *váreṇya-kratuḥ* (RV 2x). Although the influence of this cmpd, not to mention the much better attested simplex *váreṇya-*, on the hapax *vīréṇya-* is likely, I see no reason to emend the text. Moreover, I find over-fastidious the concern expressed by all that *vīrá-* is not a verb and does not deserve a gerundive suffix, producing a "monstrous" (Old) form. On the one hand, as Ge points out, there is a denom. *vīraya-*; however, Ge also argues that the denom. is intrans. and for *that* reason doesn't deserve a gerundive. So he constructs a possible transitive sense "desire to have X as hero/master," which – finally – deserves a gerundive. His tr. of the relevant bits is "Indra muss man als seinem Meister wünschen" (fld. by JSK, DGRV II.212 "Indra, the one to be desired as a hero (by men)"). All of this seems to demand too much machinery for what appears to be a playful riff on *váreṇya-*, hence my "proper to [/worthy of] a hero."

In any case, unless one emends to a bahuvr. *váreṇya-kratuḥ* "whose resolve is worthy to be chosen," it's still necessary to take *krátuḥ* as identified with Indra, as Ge/JSK in fact do (e.g., JSK "(is) determination (incarnate)"), as does the publ. tr. Re (*Language* 29 [1953] 235) suggests that *vīreṇyaḥ krátuḥ* is a "pré-bahuvrīhi" **vīreṇyakratuḥ*, but this seems to me to detract from the vividness of the expression.

I take *suśastíḥ* as a secondary bahuvr., like *suvṛktím* in vs. 7 (see comm. there), though it's possible that it's an identification like *krátuḥ* earlier in the pāda: "Indra is resolve (and) good praise."

On *dhénā* see comm. ad vs. 3. In context Ge's "Reden" fits better here (with the verb *īṭṭe*), but if good contextual fit were our highest interpretational criterion, the RV would look very different. As in vs. 3, the point here is that Indra receives both praise and soma. I consider this to be signaled by *utā́pi* opening b. In my opinion there's a tricky shift of function in *suśastíḥ* at the end of the preceding pāda. In pāda a it is a secondary bahuvrīhi 'receiving good praise' modifying Indra, but it reverts to a karmadhārayā 'good praise' in order to serve as conjoined subject of *īṭṭe* in b, where *dhénā* is either a conjoined nominative – a series of singular subjects can take a singular verb – or an instr. "along with the (soma-)stream."

Pāda d contains another identification of Indra with an abstract entity – here "superiority" (*abhiṣṭíḥ*).

This last vs. before the clan refrain exhibits some ring-like behavior with the beginning of the hymn: *puruhūtá-* (1a, 10b), (*vípra-)vīrāḥ* (1c): *vīréṇya-* (10a), *dhénā-* (3a, 10b).

X.105 Indra

On the extreme metrical and textual problems in this hymn, see publ. intro. (in addition to detailed discussions below). I will not engage further with the meter.

The hymn also acts like a dress rehearsal for the impossible X.106 that follows immediately – still within the realm of possible decoding, if barely, but pushing the envelope.

X.105.1: The meter of this 1st vs. is esp. aberrant. See Old.

The publ. tr. follows Old's alternative word division *áva śmasā́ru dhad vā́ḥ*, which requires no change to the Saṃhitā text and has the merit of providing a full form of the 'beard' word: *-śmaśāru-* is found also in the cmpd *hári-śmaśāru* in X.96.8. (It is likely not an accident that *háryate* is found shortly before the 'beard' word here.) Ge (n. 1b) suggests rather a haplology **śmaśā́(ru) rudhad*, which is also possible. But I find his suggested meaning less likely than the one associated with the Old reading. Ge thinks Indra's beard will dam up the water=soma and keep Indra from drinking; Old that the beard (which surrounds Indra's mouth after all) will descend into the water=soma to drink. Since I prefer Old's reading, the publ. tr. should have an asterisk before "descend."

On *vātā́pya-* see comm. ad IX.93.5.

X.105.1–2: Note that 1b, 2a, and 2c all end with monosyllables (*vā́ḥ*, *véḥ*, and *dán*) respectively

X.105.2: As Old points out, *yásya* stands in effect for **yó asya* – or perhaps better **yó yásya*.

There is some disagreement over the grammatical identity of *véḥ*. Gr takes it as the gen. sg. of *ví-* 'bird'; he is followed by Lub (who does not, however, discriminate between nom. and gen. *véḥ*). By contrast Ge considers it the 2nd sg. to the root pres. of √*vi* 'pursue', and I concur: the parallel I.63.2 *ā́ yád dhárī indra vívratā véḥ* seems to me decisive.

In b *árvantā́nu śépā* (i.e., Pp. *árvantā ánu śépā*) Old suggests a haplology from *árvantā *tánu-śepā*, a reading that also requires erasure of the accent on *śépā*. Given the difficulties in construing *ánu śépā*, I have accepted his haplology.

Flg. Lub (Nominal Acc., 30), I take *rají-* here as equivalent to *ráji-* 'line' (X.100.12). (*rají-* in VI.26.6 is a PN.) Lub considers our form accentually older. See comm. ad X.100.12.

As noted ad X.99.6, *pátir dán* "lord of the household" is a somewhat incongruous designation for Indra, and it hardly fits the context here, with its emphasis on the speed of Indra's horses: he's unlikely to be sitting at home.

X.105.2–4: At least acdg. to my interpr. the two relative clause of 2 (*yásya*) and 3ab (*yóḥ*), with two different referents, are never resolved. Instead 3cd begins a new subord. cl. (*yád*), whose main cl. is (sort of) found in 4. The syntax thus adds to the general shiftiness of the hymn.

X.105.3: The apparent mockery of Indra begins here.

Another monosyllable, *yóḥ*, though not in final position. Assuming that the standard identification of this form as gen.-loc. du. of the rel. prn. is correct, it is the only instance of this

form in the RV (unless there is one in vs. 3; see immed. below); the ordinary form is disyllabic *yáyoḥ*. The pāda-opening sequence *ápa yóḥ* plays off *sácāyóḥ* opening 4a.

The verb *pā́paja* is the only verb form attested to a putative root √*pāj* in Sanskrit (though it has abundant cognates across IE). On the grounds of accent and heavy redupl., Sch (Intens. 151–52) takes it as an intensive (so already Old, contra Wh), though with *t*-less perfect-like 3rd sg. ending. Kü tacitly accepts this non-perfect interpr., since he does not discuss the form; his tr. of the passage (336, 525) follow Sch's. As an intens., the verb matches *cárkṛṣe* in the same position in 4a. Note the distant phonetic figure with the preverb in tmesis: *ápa ... pā́paja*.

On the position of *ná* in Lub's pāda division, see comm. ad X.111.7: *pace* Lub, *ná* is not pāda-final, but internal in the next cl. The pāda division (8 12) is really *ápa yór índraḥ pā́paja, ā́ márto ná śaśramāṇó bibhīvā́n*, which accords with the sense.

Note rhyming *bibhīvā́n* # / *távisīvān* # at the ends of pādas b and c, anticipating *śipríṇīvān* at the end of 5c.

Although Ge takes c with ab, and of course the verse boundary favors this, the *yád* clause of pāda c does not belong logically with ab: if Indra is apart from his horses, he hasn't yoked them. Pāda c makes more sense with the contrastive 4a.

X.105.4: The sequence *sácāyóḥ* (also in 9c) can be resolved in several different ways. The Pp. takes the second word to be *āyóḥ*, presumably gen./abl. of *āyú-* 'lively', while Gr (fld. by Lub) prefers *ayóḥ* (gen./loc. du. of *ayám*) and Old and Ge *yóḥ* (gen./loc. du. of rel., as in 3a; so apparently also Sch [Intens. 108]). The first is unlikely; the other two have complementary merits and demerits. The rel. prn. would account for the accent on *cárkṛṣe*, but would leave us without a main cl.; the demonstr. has the exact opposite qualities. I weakly favor the demonst. *ayóḥ*, despite the verb accent. The identical sequence in 9c appears to have the demonst., as do those in I.174.6, III.54.2, and I also feel that a main cl. works better in context. I do not have an explanation for the accent; we could ascribe it to the supposed corruption of this particular hymn, which seems facile, or to the parallelism of the intens. *pā́paja* in 3a (though the forms are not phonologically or morphologically similar), but I do not find that satisfactory either. Perhaps because it implicitly contrasts with the same verb to be supplied in c, it has contrastive accent.

The form *upānasáḥ* has been much discussed: see esp. Old and Ge. I follow Ge's suggestion (n. 4b) that it is a Beiwagen, an auxiliary vehicle of some sort – as a metaphorical measure of Indra's relative unimportance in comparison to his horses (in the teasing vein found in this hymn).

The opening of the vs. *sácāyór* is paralleled by the opening of the hemistich *nadáyor vívratayoḥ*. Note that *vívrata-* was also found in 2a; the term associated with it there, *suyújā*, has already been actualized in 3c *yád yuyujé* "when he has yoked (the two)."

X.105.5: The ref. of the dual *vyácasvantā* in the simile is unclear. Ge takes it as modifying the horses and meaning "die gleichsam Platz haben," which is unsatisfying on several counts; it's not really a simile and *vyácas-* doesn't mean simply 'place' but 'expanse'. The identical form *vyácasvantā* is found in VI.25.6, referring to the two opposing martial forces, which is no help here. The fem. pl. *vyácasvatīḥ* is used twice of the Divine Doors, again no help. I think the most likely referent is Heaven and Earth, which individually or jointly serve as both subj. and obj. of √*vyac* (in different passages), e.g., X.112.4 *yásya tyát te mahimā́nam ..., imé mahī́ ródasī nā́viviktām* "you whose greatness these two great world-halves did not encompass." The point of such expressions is to indicate that even very expansive entities, like H+E, cannot contain Indra;

they are themselves therefore implicitly *vyácas-vant*. The problem is that H+E / world-halves expressions are generally feminine. Here, I would attribute the non-fem. *-vantā* form to agreement with the simile frame *kéśasvantā* immediately preceding it across the pāda boundary. The use of *ádhi* √*sthā* for 'mounting' heaven is found in IX.83.2, 85.9, 86.8.

The adj. *śipríṇīvān* is way overdetermined, with both an *-in*-suffix and a *-vant-* suffix. The latter appears to be attached to a fem. *śipríṇī-*. This reminds us of the unexpected fem. for masc. gen. pl. *śipríṇīnām* in I.30.11 (see comm. ad loc.). However, here I think the impetus to create this nonce form came from the desire to rhyme with *babhīvā́n* (3b) and esp. *táviṣīvān* (3c).

X.105.6: With Ge, I take *ṛṣvébhiḥ* as a ref. to the Maruts.

Also with Ge, I would supply *vájram* as the obj. of *tatákṣa* in b, even though it seems somewhat odd for Indra to fashion his own mace, rather than Tvaṣṭar (though see I.121.3 adduced by Ge [n. 6b], not to mention the next vs., 7a, where the middle voice of *cakré* supports the interpr.). (The designation *śū́raḥ* seems to guarantee that the subj. is Indra: see 4c *sū́ra índraḥ*.)

I have no idea what to do with Mātariśvan here, nor does anyone else. See comm. on the next vs., however.

X.105.7: Vss. 6 and 7 seem intertwined. As was just noted, 7a supplements or indeed repairs 6b, and I will now suggest that Mātariśvan at the end of 6 should be construed with the orphaned simile at the end of 7.

The two words that form pāda b, *hirīmaśó hírīmān*, most likely display a playful riff on *hári-* 'golden' (see EWA II.806). In particular, *hirīmaśáḥ* echoes the likewise phonologically deformed *(háryate…) śmaśā́ (ru-)* in 1b, itself built on *hári-śmaśāru* in X.96.8, as well as *híri-śmaśru-* 'having a golden beard', an epithet of Agni (V.7.7, X.46.5) with the same *hírī-* as here. The word 'beard' seems to attract word play. Given this web of verbal associations, I'd now emend the tr. to "gold*bearded, golden," in an attempt to capture the phonological manipulation in *hirīmaśó*. See Old on this word, though he rejects the association with 'beard'.

The word play continues in c: *-hanu-* 'jaw' plays on *-hánāya* 'to smash'. Ge (n. 7c) is somewhat puzzled about why Indra is described as 'having an unbroken jaw'. As he points out, there is a surprising amount of attention paid, here and there, to Indra smashing Vṛtra's jaws, so perhaps the description here of Indra's intact jaw is a counterweight to Vṛtra's jaw injury – but the pun it allows with *-hánāya* also has to be taken into account, and that pun becomes cuter when a different word for 'break, smash' is used in *áruta-* 'unbroken'.

The simile *ádbhutaṃ ná rájaḥ* poses yet another puzzle, and the publ. tr.'s "(Indra) is like the infallible airy realm (?)" is worse than useless. (Ge [n. 7c] at least tries to make sense of it.) I don't have a simple solution, but I can at least now offer something potentially better than what I produced in the publ. tr. We can start with the fact that *rájas-* is regularly a vast expanse to be crossed or measured out, mostly located in or around the midspace, since birds are among its traversers. It could then be used here as a measure of Indra's own vastness – hence a simile in the nom., as both Ge and the publ. tr. take it. However, I will tentatively suggest a bold alternative – desperate situations call for desperate measures. As noted just above, Mātariśvan hangs at the end of vs. 6 with nothing to do, unintegrated into the rest of the vs.; *ádbhutaṃ ná rájaḥ* is similarly positioned and similarly unintegrated in this vs. It might be possible to read them together, as a disjunctive simile, with an indirect connection to the Vṛtra myth. Recall that in the archetypal Indra–Vṛtra hymn I.32, after killing Vṛtra, Indra, like a frightened falcon, flees across

the *rájāṃsi* (I.32.14 *śyenó ná bhītó átaro rájāṃsi*). Recall also that Mātariśvan is the fire-stealer, who brings fire from heaven (*diváḥ* I.93.6), from afar / a great distance (*parāvatáḥ* I.128.2, III.9.5, VI.8.4). I suggest that in 6c/7c Indra's flight across the *rájas-* is compared to Mātariśvan's, if we construct the simile from the undigested pieces that end those two vss. – however hard this is to convey in translation. I'd suggest something like the following as revision for both vss.

6. He of lofty might has struck up the praise song with the lofty ones. The champion fashioned it with his swelling strength,
like an artisan (/Ṛbhu) in accord with his intentions. (Like) Mātariśvan ...
7. Who made his own mace, to smash the barbarian easily -- he, golden-colored, golden, with unbroken jaw -- (fleeing) like (Mātariśvan) across the *ádbhutam* realm."

This leaves us with the always difficult *ádbhutam*: the standard 'unerring, infallible' does not fit well here (nor does it always elsewhere; see, e.g., comm. ad V.87.7). Perhaps, with semantic bleaching in this late hymn, 'ineffable'.

X.105.8: I take *yajñá ṛ́dhak* as referring to a sacrifice undertaken by a particular, individual sacrificer -- a sense that seems to be supported by X.93.8. It could also be a sacrifice destined for an individual god (here Indra), an interpr. that is supported by VI.49.10.

The problem in c is *jóṣati*. Ge takes it as the 3rd sg. finite verb it appears to be, but this comes at a high cost: he must assign it a meaning 'please, give pleasure' ("dass es dir gefalle") contrary to the sense of the overwhelming number of attestations of this very common root, which consistently mean 'enjoy, take pleasure'. (Ge [n. 8c] cites only two parallels, which can both be interpr. otherwise.) One could attribute this unexpected meaning to the act. voice, as opposed to med. *juṣáte*, etc., but other active forms have the 'enjoy' sense (e.g., *joṣat* in X.81.7). I prefer Old's suggestion (explicitly rejected by Ge) that *jóṣati* is a loc. of a pres. act. part., forming a loc. absol. with *tvé*. Unfortunately this is not morphologically unproblematic: no such part. is attested, and the status of the thematic *jóṣa-* stem with full-grade accented root isn't clear to me. It's possible that this restrained set of forms are subjunctives built somehow to *juṣá-*, or to a root aor. distinct from that stem (so Wh. Roots and Macd. VGS; see now comm. ad X.158.2) and then misinterpr. -- though both the voice and the accent would have to shift. Nonetheless, the loc. absol. interpr. causes fewer problems than Ge's finite form.

X.105.9: Verse-final *sácāyóḥ* matches the same form opening vs. 4 (q.v.); I take then both as containing the loc. du. demonst. *ayóḥ*. Although one might hypothesize that these two identical forms demarcate a section of the hymn ring-compositionally, the contents of these vss. seems too various to admit this explanation. I do think the dual referent should be the same as in vs. 4, namely Indra's two horses – though the boat makes obvious difficulties.

With Gr and Ge, I take *tretíṇī* as referring to the totality of the three ritual fires, but the feminine is puzzling. For this reason Old suggests that it might instead refer to fem. entities that might be 'aloft, upright' (*ūrdhvā́*), like Dawns or prayers, but neither of those comes in a standard triad. The sequence *-íṇī bhū́t* may anticipate *upasécanī bhūt* in the next vs. (10a), which might account for the unusual fem. I would make a small alteration in the publ. tr., from "threefold one" to "triad."

The acc. phrase *nā́vaṃ svayaśasam* "boat having its own glory" is left hanging in c, with nothing to govern it; a verb needs to be supplied. Ge goes with "board" reasonably enough, on the basis of *ā́ √ruh / sthā* passages (e.g., VII.88.3); "make" would be possible on the basis of nearby X.101.2 *nā́vam ... kṛṇudhvam*, and "launch/send forth" is also possible (e.g., X.116.9 *prérayaṃ nā́vam*). In any case the boat is metaphorical; the question is what it stands for – the sacrifice or a hymn/sacred formulation are the most likely candidates. Cf., e.g., II.42.1=IX.95.2 *íyarti vā́cam aritéva nā́vam*.

X.105.10: Ge (n. 10a and tr.) interpr. *pṛ́śnir upasécanī* somewhat oddly as a dappled cow that pours ("die bunte Kuh, die zugiesst"), but the same fem. *upasécanī* in X.21.2 he takes as a ladle (appropriately). I think it must be a ritual instr. here as well, qualified as 'dappled' because the substance it contains (melted butter?) has that appearance.

It seems a little odd that Indra should be pouring his own drink, but perhaps it's of a piece with his making his own mace in vss. 6 and 7.

X.105.11: The first pāda is puzzling. Ge supplies both another measuring unit, to account for the *vā*, and a verb, producing "Wenn dich auch Hundert oder (mehr) dagegen (preisen)." This yields sense: even if 100 or more other poets praise you, Sumitra [the poet of the hymn] has praised you -- presumably better or more effectively. Unfortunately it also requires supplying a lot of material, and it also does not account well for the *práti* (his "dagegen"): *√stu* does not occur with *práti*. Old toys with this interpr. among others, incl. the possibility that *práti* expresses equivalence, as in II.1.8 *tvā́ṃ sahásrāṇi śatā́ dáśa práti* "you are the counter(-part) to thousands, hundreds, tens" (cf. also II.1.15). The publ. tr. adopts this interpr., as it requires supplying no additional material. I now realize that at least as it appears in the publ. tr. it also doesn't make a lot of sense. The point as I see it is that even if there were a hundred Indras, or heroes like Indra, Sumitra's praise would be sufficient to include them all. It might be a little clearer if the tr. were altered to "Even if a hundred are counter(part) to you, Sumitra has praised (you) to just such an extent."

The echo clause with Durmitra is obviously some sort of joke, but of what sort escapes me. These two oppositional clauses with Su/Dur-mitra are matched by the last two clauses of the hymn. The second one, with lower-register *kutsa-vatsám* "Kutsa's kid [lit. calf]" substituting for the more formal *kutsa-putrám* "Kutsa's son," has something of the same jokey feel as the Durmitra clause.

X.106 Aśvins

As discussed in the publ. intro., this hymn has an impenetrable center, and verses 5–8 therefore remain untranslated and will be furnished with minimal commentary here. For the simile as structural principle, the omphalos shape, and the parallelism with the Aśvin hymn II.39 see the publ. intro.

X.106.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the opening of this vs. (and hymn) ... *tád íd arthayete* "you two have just this as your aim" is reminiscent of II.39.1 ... *tád íd árthaṃ jarethe* "you two awaken to just this aim," with the denom. *arthaya-* substituting for the acc. *árthaṃ* in II.39.1. The finite verb 'awaken' in that vs. is postponed to our pāda c: transitive *ajīgaḥ* corresponding to intrans. *jarethe* in II.39.1.

Various suggestions have been made for the (unexpressed) subject of *ajīgaḥ* (see Ge n. 1c, Old) – perhaps most likely is the hymn (or its singer) or Dawn. Properly speaking "you" should be in parens., since the dual obj. is expressed only by *sadhrīcīnā*.

As goal of *yā́tave*, Re suggests supplying *ártham*, extracted from the verb in pāda a, and cf. X.143.1 (also an Aśvin hymn) *ártham ... yā́tave*.

What to supply with *sudínā* is the next question; as Old points out, *sudínā* can be either masc. du. or neut. pl. He favors the former, and since most of the similes in this hymn refer to the Aśvins, this might seem the better choice. But Ge's clumsy tr. as a dual (in n. 1d he claims it can only be a dual) characterizing the Aśvins, "die guter Wetter haben," shows the drawback to this morphological analysis. Moreover, the stem *sudína-* is generally a neut. pl. and modifies 'days' (*áhāni*, etc.). Such an interpr. fits the context better: the point of the simile is that the Aśvins, who are early-morning visitors to the sacrifice, "bring" the days.

The VP *pṛ́kṣa ā́ taṃsayethe* is a more vivid version of, e.g., I.47.6 *pṛ́kṣo vahatam aśvinā* "convey nourishments [/provisions], o Aśvins." As disc. in my *-áya-* book (p. 93), the sense of √*taṃs* is difficult to circumscribe, given its rarity and (contrariwise) the variety of preverbs found with it, but 'tug, yank' and similar abrupt movements fit the contexts. The preverb *ā́* 'here' makes the action goal-directed, and 'haul' may capture a certain arduous quality. As Re points out, the verb is also playing off *(ví) tanvāthe* to √*tan* in b.

X.106.2: This vs. is full of uncertain words, several of which appear to concern agriculture. I will not pursue the desperate and dubious etymologies and meanings suggested for them – here consult Old, Ge, Re (EVP XVI.74), and EWA s.vv.

Needless to say, I make no claims of certainty about the translation – save for pāda c, which seems surprisingly straightforward. It is probably not an accident that c also has a semi-parallel in II.39.1 <u>*dūtéva*</u> *hávyā* <u>*jányā*</u> *purutrā́* "like messengers serving the people, you are to be called upon in many places" (cf. our *dūtéva ... jáneṣu*). As with vs. 1 and its parallel in II.39.1, one word is postponed: *purutrā́* appears in 3c.

X.106.3: Lacking opaque words, this vs. is clearer than the last.

In b we should expect dual **paśū́,* as in the YAves. dual dvandva *pasu.vīra*. We can't put too much faith in the morphology of this hymn anyway, and I would suggest that the *paśvā́* that underlies *paśvéva* simply shows an assimilation to the numerous duals in *-ā* characterizing the Aśvins in this hymn, particularly *pakṣā́*, which immediately precedes it across the pāda break — as well as matching the *-ā–iva* ➔ *-eva* pāda-opening similes that abound in the hymn (1d, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3d, 4b, 4c [2x], 4d, etc.).

For 'bright' (*citrá-*) livestock, see the passages cited by Ge (n. 3b).

The goal *yájuḥ* in b may play off *(sākaṃ)yújā* in pāda a.

As Re points out, the Aśvins are earth-circlers themselves (*párijman-* I.46.14), so it's somewhat pleonastic to compare them to the same.

X.106.4: The publ. tr. follows Ge, Re (and implicitly Old) in supplying a verb of address ("I call upon you ..."), with the Aśvins and their trailing similes now in the acc. This is partly because of the apparent enclitic *vaḥ*, which needs some structure to attach to, and partly because of the father/son configuration: one of the things sons do to fathers is call on them (e.g., VII.32.3 *putró ná pitáraṃ huve*). But with regard to the latter, it is puzzling why both fathers and sons are in the dual (see Ge's equally puzzled n. 4a). And the *vaḥ* is even more troubling: it's plural, and if

there's anything the poet of this hymn knows how to do it's produce duals! Despite Old's ultimate rejection of this idea (after toying with it for quite awhile), I accept Henry's suggestion that the sequence *āpī́ vo asmé* conceals the simile particle *iva*; Old (in his toying phase) suggests the reading **āpī́va asmé*; since *vo* would have been read *va* in this sandhi situation, the real underlying *-va* was wrongly restored to *vo* once *āpī́* was separated from *iva*. This eliminates the problematic plural and its need for structure. Since the Aśvins are relentlessly nominative throughout this hymn (even apparently in the untranslatable parts) as well as in the similar II.39, and since "I call upon" is made up out of whole cloth (the *hávam* in d, adduced by Re, is irrelevant: *hávam ā́ gamiṣṭam* there is just a variant on *yájur ā́ gamiṣṭam* in 3b), I would simply eliminate "(I call upon you,) who are" and tr. the first three pādas as a string of nominal similes: "like friends to us, like fathers, (like) sons, like ..." Although *putrā́* lacks a simile marker and it might seem slightly strange to compare the Aśvins to our sons, this first pāda proposes a series of close relationships we might share with those gods.

In the simile *ugréva rucā́* I supply Heaven and Earth as the referents of *ugrā́*. They are called *ugrā́* in X.121.5 and appear with *rucā́* in IV.56.1.

On *írya-* see comm. ad V.58.4. Since it twice appears with *gopā́-* 'herdsman' (VII.13.3, VIII.41.4), both times in similes, I have supplied 'herdsmen' here as well, esp. since there is an agriculture strain in this hymn.

On the likely meaning of du. *kiráṇā* (presumably separate from *kiráṇa-* 'dust') as labia (or at least something "obscene," so Old), see Old, Ge n. 4c, Re; EWA does not treat it separately as far as I can tell.

X.106.5–8: Although these vss. contain a number of (apparently) interpretable words and phrases (e.g., 5b *mitréva ṛtā́*, 7d *kṣayad rayīṇā́m*), they glitter like fool's gold in the mass of material that seems frustratingly always just on the other side of intelligibility. What is most salient about the passage – as others have also remarked – is the phonological and morphological patterning. For example, forms with intensive-type reduplication or near reduplication: 6ab ... *jarbhárī turphárītū ... turphárī parpharī́kā*, 7a *cárcaram*, 7b *tartarītha(ḥ)*, 7d *parpharat*, 8c *turphárī phā́rivā́ram*; adjacent deformations like 7c *kharamajrā́ kharájrur*; runs of slightly variant syllables like 7a *cárcaraṃ jā́ram marā́yu*, 6c *(udanya)jéva jémanā maderū́*, 6d *jarā́yv ajáram marā́yu*. The rare-ish phonemes *ph* and *kh* are especially highlighted (starting actually with *phárvareṣu* in 2a).

X.106.9: As noted in the publ. intro., the exit from the gibberish of the middle omphalos vss. to the relative intelligibility of the outer ones is teasingly accompanied by a promise of "firm standing in the depths."

In pāda a I again supply "Heaven and Earth" as referents for *bṛhántā* 'lofty'. The fem. dual *bṛhatī́* regularly modifies *ródasī* the 'two world halves', as well as *dyā́vāpṛthivī́* (IV.56.1, VII.53.1), and a reference to H+E here in the first of the post-omphalos vss. would form a ring with the reference in 4b, the last of the pre-omphalos vss.

śā́suḥ in c matches the same word in 2b, helping to provide the ring around the omphalos (though not situated in the directly corresponding vs.).

In d, flg. Ludwig (see Old), I take *áṃśā* as an elliptical dual referring to two minor Ādityas, Aṃśa 'share' and Bhaga 'portion, fortune' (on the close association between Aṃśa and Bhaga see Brereton, Ādityas, 307–8). Bhaga is indirectly present in the verb *bhajatam* of this

pāda, as well as (perhaps) in *bhágevitā* in the preceding vs., 8b. Note in passing that the poet of this hymn is named Bhūtāṃśa (named in 11d and assigned the hymn by the Anukr.).

X.106.10: The agricultural cast of the second vs. of this hymn returns in this, the penultimate vs.

Gr and Re suggest that the hapax *āraṅgará-* is a word for bee, but this seems unlikely; instead it seems a phonological play on the actual word for bee, *sāraghá-*, that begins the next pāda. Best, with Ge, to leave it untr.; in context it ought to refer to a husbandman or someone/thing responsible for producing milk in cows (assuming *gávi* refers to an actual cow).

In the publ. tr. I supply parenthetical "(milk)" as the obj. of *érayethe* in the frame, with *mádhu* the corresponding object in the simile. I now think it is more likely that *mádhu* is used metaphorically for milk as well as literally to (bees') honey and is shared by simile and frame. For the structure of the frame, cf. VIII.89.7 *āmā́su pakvám aíraya(ḥ)* "you raised/produced the cooked (milk) in the raw (cows)." Note also the final vs. of this hymn, 11c *pakvā́ṃ mádhu góṣv antáḥ* "the cooked 'honey' within the cows." I would now slightly emend the tr. to "... you produce the 'honey' in the cow ... as bees produce honey."

On *-bāra-* in *nicī́na-bāra-* see comm. ad VIII.40.5. The explanation of this form (also in *jihmá-bāra-* 'with sloping banks') as showing a Middle-Indic-type intervocalic voicing of *pārá-* 'opposite shore, edge' is very plausible and would fit the register of this hymn. However, the semantic dev. from 'bank' to (supposed) 'opening' should receive a bit of attention. I assume a trajectory from 'opposite shore' to 'edge' and from 'edge' to 'rim' of a container. The rim surrounds the opening, and *nīcī́na-bāra-* would describe a container turned upside down. See also I.116.9. The occurrence of this cmpd in VIII.72.10 has a more literal sense, applied to a well.

I attach pāda c to ab, because like them it concerns the production of a liquid substance.

On the hapax *kīnā́ra-* and its relation to *kīnā́śa-* (RV 1x, but common later), both of obscure etymology, see EWA s.vv. It is very likely that our hapax owes its *-āra-* to the phonological deformation that characterizes this hymn.

Ge renders *kṣā́meva* as "wie zwei magere (Tiere)," flg. Sāy. *kṣāmā = kṣīnā gauḥ* (see also, tentatively, Scar p. 38 and n. 47); I'm not sure what etymon he is thinking of. But it surely belongs to *kṣám-* 'earth', with Old and Re. It should be an elliptical dual, (Heaven and) Earth, as it is in II.39.7. But here the analysis is complicated by the fact that the associated adjective *sūyavasā́t* 'feeding on good pasture' (*sūyavasa-ád-*) is sg. (and the Pp reads *kṣā́ma*). I think that the poet created a nonce singular (aided by the vowel-quantity-obliterating sandhi in *kṣā́meva*) and that only the earth, conceived of as a cow (as often), is at issue.

Note that *sacethe* is also found in II.39, vs. 2, though in a slightly different usage.

X.106.11: As noted in the publ. intro., the last vs. of this hymn resembles the last one of II.39 (vs. 8). The praises for the Aśvins are proffered -- *bráhma stómam* in II.39.9, *stómam ... mántram* here – and the poet urges the Aśvins to drive near: *úpa yātam* in both. In both the poet or poets proclaim their achievement with their own name: II.39.8b *bráhma stómaṃ gṛtsamadā́so akran* "The Gṛtsamādas have made the formulation and praise song"; X.106.11d *ā́ bhūtā́ṃśo aśvinóh kā́mam aprāḥ* "Bhūtāṃśa has fulfilled the desire of the Aśvins."

X.107 Dakṣiṇā

This hymn has certain points of contact with the second section of Kakṣīvant's Prātaritvan hymn, I.125, vss. 4–7, which describe the cosmic rewards for the generous sacrificer.

X.107.1: As Ge points out, dakṣiṇās were distributed at the dawn sacrifice in RVic times, in contrast to the midday distribution in classical śrauta ritual. The emphasis on the coming of light in this vs. fits this ritual fact.

I do not think that neut. *jīvám* has the sense 'life' in the RV (see also I.164.30) and would alter the tr. to "everything living."

X.107.2: See I.125.5–6, esp. for our second hemistich.

X.107.3: It is quite possible that *kavāríbhyaḥ* in b is abl., not dat., as it is usually taken: "It is not *from* the stingy" (so Maurer, p. 299). I think it is likely meant to be both: the dakṣiṇā doesn't come *from* the stingy, and the great rewards of giving it don't come *to* the stingy. I would now allow the alt. tr.

X.107.4: Similar cosmic fertility is described in I.125.4–7, though there is little or no overlap in phraseology.

X.107.6: As Ge points out (n. 6ab), the five figures named are the poet and the four principal priests (Brahman, Adhvaryu, Udgātar, and Hotar) of the classical śrauta ritual.

I do not follow Ge (n. 6c, fld by Maurer, p. 299) in seeing the "three bodies of the blazing one" (*śukrásya tanvàḥ ... tisráḥ*) as the three Vedas (anachronisticallly), but rather as the three ritual fires.

X.107.7: Note the "X and which Y" construction in b, which is followed in c by a izafe-like nominal clause.

As Ge points out (n. 7c), there is gender attraction in the nominal pseudo-izafe clause *yó na ātmā́*, which qualifies neut. *ánnam* but whose rel. prn, coreferential with *ātmā́*, is masc. to agree with that noun.

X.107.8: Although it is tempting (a temptation that Ge and Maurer gave in to) to tr. the pf. *mamruḥ* as presential, "they do not die," the parallel pf. *īyuḥ* has preterital value, and as Kü demonstrates (370–71), in older Vedic the pf. of √*mṛ* had past-related usage.

Note the appearance of both *víśva-* and *sárva-*, overlapping here in the late RV. Here the older form *víśva-* appears in the very common fixed phrase *(idáṃ) víśvam bhúvanam* "(this) whole world (here)" (I.73.8, 102.8, etc. etc.), while its replacement *sárva-* is found in freer usage.

X.107.9: Another izafe-type construction, ... *vadhvàṃ yā́ suvā́sāḥ*. There are a surprising number of such nominal relatives in this hymn.

The exact sense of *antaḥpéyaṃ súrāyāḥ* "the right to the inner drinking of liquor" is unclear to me (and others); it seems odd to grant to the pious and generous sacrificer access to the generally forbidden, or at least disdained, *surā*. For speculations see Old, Ge, Re.

In d the obj. **tā́n*, referent of the rel. *yé*, has been gapped (so already Sāy.; see Ge n. 9d). The defeated uninvited (*áhūtāḥ*) contrast with the invited (*hūtáḥ*) dakṣinā-bestower in 5a.

X.107.11: The first hemistich contains two elementary etymological figures: *-vā́ho vahanti* (a) and *-vṛ́t ... vartate* (b), both involving root noun cmpds.

X.108 Saramā [SJ on JPB]

The full hymn is tr. by Th (Gedichte) and HPS (B+I 185–87).

In this contentious dialogue it's worth noting that the participants often match their words exactly, or as exactly as they can, esp. at the beginning. This practice is reminscent of the Yama / Yamī dialogue (X.10) and to a lesser extent that of Purūravas and Urvaśi (X.95).

X.108.1: The position of *prá* in tmesis is somewhat odd, in that it does not adjoin a metrical boundary as often.

There are almost as many interpr. and etym. of *jáguri-* as there are commentators. Given the *-ur-* vocalism and the velar root initial, we need a seṭ root containing a velar/labiovelar and a liquid. This disqualifies Gr's √*gā* and probably Wh/Old's √*jṝ* 'waste away, make old' (with old palatal initial, though a secondary unetym. velar isn't entirely excluded), leaving √*gṝ* 'swallow' (as in the publ. tr., from Th, Gedichte), √*gṝ* 'sing, greet' (probably excluded on semantic grounds), and √*glā* 'become weary' (KH, reported in KEWA, EWA). This last seems a possible alt. to 'swallowing': 'wearying'.

X.108.2: Saramā hews very closely to the words of her questioners, with the responsions 1a/2b *ichántī* ; 1a/2c *ānaṭ* / *āvat* ; 1d/2d *ataraḥ* / *ataram* (in fact the whole of the d pādas).

In pāda a I would be inclined to read *iṣitā́* as *iṣitā́ ā́*, with *ā́* the preverb with *carāmi*: "I travel here ..."

In c the publ. tr. follows Ge's interpr. (see n. 2c) that it is the Rasā who is afraid – specifically fearing losing her reputation as a great river if a mere dog can jump over her. Th by contrast takes the fear to be Saramā's when she faces the great river, a fear she overcomes by remembering that she's Indra's messenger. This seems possible and in fact less convoluted than Ge's suggestion.

X.108.3: The Paṇis then echo Saramā's words echoing their own: *yásya ... dūtī́ḥ* (3b) matching *índrasya dūtī́ḥ* (2a), while *ásaraḥ* (3b) rhymes with *ataraḥ* (1d) and anticipates *ásaram* in 4b. Note also the repetition *idám* (1a, 3b) and near-rep. *parākā́t* (3b) beside *parācaíḥ* (1b).

A clear example of subordinating *ca*, marked by accent on the verb *gáchāt*.

X.108.4: The subject prn. *ahám* is not only emphatic but also nec. to disambiguate the person of *veda*.

The pāda- and clause-final position of *sá* is rhetorically driven.

The tendency to responsion is taken to its highest pitch here, where pāda b is identical to 3b, save for the person of the verb: *ásaraḥ* (3b) / *ásaram* (4b). The latter is also an anagram (not a particularly challenging one) of *sarámā*.

The d pāda, with *hatā́ índreṇa* and the verb *śayadhve* 'you will lie', is strongly reminiscent of the insistent phraseology in the famous Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, whose signature verbs are √*han* 'smite' and √*śi* 'lie'. This sudden threat, esp. given its resonance with the Vṛtra battle, seems a distinct and surprising escalation of hostilities. The Paṇis have not so far made any overt threats, in fact quite the contrary.

X.108.5: The Paṇis respond to this escalation with their own hostile rhetoric.

Because presential copulas are almost never overt, I would take *santi* as an existential: "there exist sharp weapons of/for us" or, more idiomatically, "we have sharp weapons" (so Ge, Th, Don, though not the publ. tr.).

X.108.6: Ge, Don, and the publ. tr. take pāda a as an indicative assertion, independent of the paired pādas b and c, with the impvs. *santu* and *astu* respectively (e.g., publ. tr. "your words are no weapons ... Let your evil bodies ..."), presumably to account for the *ubhayā́* in pāda d. (That is, pādas b and c would provide a basis for 'both', but adding pāda a would produce a threesome.) Nonetheless, I follow Old, Th, and HPS (B+I 186) in supplying *santu* with pāda a as well, thereby making all three pādas parallel. The parallel morphological formation of pāda-initial *asenyā́* (a) and *aniṣavyā́ḥ* (b) support this interpr. All three pādas set forth possible propositions that may or may not be true (e.g., their bodies may be impervious to arrows or not). The *ubhayā́* then means "either way" – whether the propositions are true or not. I would substitute "Let your words be unreachable by weapons, your evil bodies impervious to arrows; let the path to you not be dareable to go on – either way ..."

As is well known, *-tavaí* infinitives are almost always followed by the particle *u* in the configuration *-tavā́ u* at pāda end (see JSK, Part. *u*, 164–67). When occurring earlier in the pāda, this configuration is not found (see p. 166 n. 10 for the 6 such passages, incl. this one). I wonder if, in this case, the *-u* of flg. *astu* has licensed the inf. here (though this explan. does not account for the other counterexx.; see comm. ad III.32.6 however).

X.108.7: The opening *ayáṃ nidhíḥ sarame* matches the opening of vs. 5, the last time the Paṇis spoke: *imā́ gā́vaḥ sarame* and should be rendered the same: "here is the treasury ..."

The publ. tr. clearly takes *nyṛ̀ṣta-* to √*arṣ* 'flow'; I prefer to derive it from √*ṛṣ* 'pierce, stick' and tr. 'crammed with'.

If *álakam* is derived from *álam* (AV) = *áram* 'fit(ting), enough' (so EWA s.v.), how do we get to the negative sense 'in vain'? Perhaps through the contemptuous diminutive *-ka-* as 'little enough'?

X.108.8: *sómaśitā(ḥ)* gives a bad cadence. It is tempting to read *-*śīta-* (borrowed from weak forms of redupl. pres. *śiśīhí*, *śíśīte*, etc. However, the other occurrence of *sómaśita-* is metrically indifferent and those of the past part. in general are best read light. The long *ī* of the redupl. pres. is not entirely expected, and in some cases the forms would be better with short *i*.

X.108.9: Why the accent on *ājagántha*? Either another ex. of subordinating *ca* ("if/even though you have come ...," so the publ. tr.) or (per Th) *evā́ ca tváṃ sarame* is a separate clause ("and also you, S" – meaning she's also going to vomit up her words), with *ājagántha* starting a new clause. But this doesn't work, because the preverb *ā́* should take the accent then if this is a main cl. verb.

X.108.11: Contra the publ. tr. (but with Ge and Mau), I think vs. 11 is spoken by Saramā, not a "narrator." For one thing, pāda a is almost identical to Saramā's last utterance in the immediately preceding verse (10d). Perhaps more important, a narrator has no business issuing commands -- the two imperatives in pādas a and b (*ita*, *yantu*) -- or participating in the dialogue by addressing the Paṇis, but should rather summarize what has already happened. In my view, Saramā is emphatically putting her stamp on the episode by repeating her dismissive order to the Paṇis.

Pāda a is a syllable short. Old (and HvN) read *dūrám* with disyllabic initial, but there's no etymological justification for this, and note that it forms a ring with *dūré* in 1b, which isn't distracted. Better, I think, to have a "pause," with *ita* in the same metrical position as in 10d. This is sometimes a ploy – metrical disturbance to call attention to (not quite) matching verbal patterns. The ring of *dūré* / *dūrám*, though consisting of a single word, is conceptually significant: in vs. 1 it is Saramā who is associated with distance -- she has come from a long way away -- but in the course of the dialogue she has gained the ability to order the Paṇis into the distance. The tables have turned.

Strictly speaking the phrase "from here" in the publ. tr. should be deleted; the *átaḥ* "from here" found in 10d is absent from this almost identical pāda. I would substitute "far away."

The phrase *minatîr ṛtéṇa* is difficult. Old and Ge think it should be read **mimatîḥ* 'bellowing' (√*mā* 'bellow', with redupl. pres. *mímāti*), which would be convenient. But ours is the more difficult reading – to √*mī* 'change, exchange / confound' – maybe "exchanging (their places)" with *ṛtéṇa* separate ("come up acdg. to truth [=the singing of B+the Aṅg.]"; or if it needs to be construed with the participle, possibly supply an obj., like I.117.3 *minántā ... māyā́ḥ* "confounding (the wiles of the Paṇis) with truth" or "exchanging (the wiles of the Paṇis) with truth."

X.109 All Gods [Brahman's Wife]

On my interpr. of the hymn see not only the publ. intro. but the detailed treatment of it in my 2016 article "Ṛgveda X.109: The 'Brahman's Wife' and the Ritual Patnī," in *The Vedas in Indian Culture and History: Proceedings of the Fourth International Vedic Conference (Austin, Texas 2007)* (ed. Joel P. Brereton), pp. 207–20, which also discusses the tangled history of its interpr. To sketch my views briefly, the hymn is one of several in the late RV that concern the fraught introduction of the ritual Patnī into solemn sacrifice. The hymn both proclaims the great benefits that the Patnī brings to the sacrifice and also discounts the possible risk of placing her on the ritual ground in contact with the gods. The implausible interpr. that held sway previously, that this is a very early version of a tale in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa about King Soma's abduction and return of Bṛhaspati's wife, can now fortunately be discarded.

My treatment of the hymn assumes an omphalos structure: the initial and final vss. (1, 7) present the "offense" (*kilbiṣá-*) and its expiation; the outer ring (2, 6) the giving back of the wife; the inner, omphalos vss. (3–5) the wife's activities on the ritual ground.

As noted in the cited article, there are two not-entirely-parallel versions of the hymn in the AV: Ś V.17, P IX.15, whose interrelations I discuss in n. 54 of the article. Jeong-Soo Kim's edition and tr. of AVP VIII and IX (2014) appeared long after I wrote the article and while it was still languishing in press, but the Kim treatment does not add much relevant.

The hymn is too short for its position in the text; we should expect 11 vss. I discuss this question in connection with the two AV versions in n. 54 of the art. cit.

I would now add a few things to the interpr. found in the article, inspired by the difficult vs. 5 (for more on which see below), which I did not treat in that article. Although I still believe that the hymn primarily concerns the ritual Patnī, I think it also has connections to the Brahmacārin, the Vedic student, whose designation appears in vs. 5 for the only time in the RV. Like the Patnī the Brahmacārin is an innovation in the religious structure: he is well established in the AV – the word *brahmacārín-* appears dozens of times, along with a fair representation of the abstract *brahmacárya-* — but neither the word (save for our vs. 5) nor the concept is Rigvedic. The pioneering reformers responsible for the introduction of the ritual Patnī were no

doubt also implicated in the development of celibate studentship, and they must have been aware of the conceptual polarization that the Patnī and the Brahmacārin represented – one embodying sexuality and fertility, the other chastity and fervent austerity. Our hymn has some phraseological and conceptual connections with the AV hymn "extolling the Vedic student (brahmacārín)" (Whitney's title): AVŚ XI.5 ≅ AVP XVI.153–55. In addition to the word *brahmacārín-* itself, also *tápas-* (vss. 1, 4), a word that appears in practically every vs. of the AV Brahmacārin hymn. Other connections will be noted ad the individual vss.

X.109.1: As noted in the art. cit., the speakers in this vs. are mostly natural forces, esp. the waters both in their own form and as the boundless ocean (*ákūpāraḥ saliláḥ*). I suggest there that since in later Vedic waters are prescribed for the removal of a *kilbiṣá-*, esp. at the final bath (*avabhṛtha*) of the Sacrificer and his Wife in śrauta ritual, the waters may owe their prominence in this vs. to that function. I cannot so readily account for the other players. However, note that Mātariśvan is found in the AV Brahmacārin hymn along with the waters (*mātaríśvan ... apsú*: Ś XI.5.13≅P XVI.154.4) and *salilá-* in the same hymn (Ś vs. 26 = P XVI.155.6). On Mātariśvan see Insler/Brereton forthcoming in *JASPA*. Since this divinity, originally the one who stole fire from heaven, has been reinterpreted as the wind already in the AV and may be on the way there in the late RV, his presence here may be as a natural force comparable to the waters and the ocean.

Both *salilá-* and *tápas-* are ordinarily neut., but appear to be masc. in this vs. (so Old), perhaps as animatized forces? All three versions (RV, AVŚ, AVP) have m. *saliláh*, but P has neut. *vīḷúharas* and *ugrám*, versus *-harās* and *ugró* in RV and Ś. Re (EVP XVI.162) suggests that *vīḷúharās tápa(ḥ)* is the "resolution" of an avoided three-member compd **vīḷuharastapas* (no accent given), an explanation I am somewhat sympathetic to, though it would help if he had indicated what he thought it meant and what its structure would be. Perhaps a 2nd member dvandva *-haras-tapas-* in a bahuvrīhi: *"possessing staunch rage and fervor"? But we must deal with the ill-assorted elements we have in the text.

As also disc. in the art., the *brahma-kilbiṣá-* could be either an offense committed against a brahman or by him. I opt for the former (as do most interpr.). The precise offense, in my view, is the separation of the Wife from her husband when she performs her duties on the ritual ground and interacts with the gods there, in what could be interpr. as sexual contact. Even though the brahman probably initiated the ritual, the separation could technically be considered a *kilbiṣā́-* committed against him.

X.109.2: This is the first mention of the "giving back" of the Brahman's wife. The list of gods involved in her return remind us of the gods who serve as husbands to the bride before she is married to her human spouse in the wedding hymn (X.85.40–41) – as I am not the first to notice. The first and last gods there are Soma and Agni, matching the endpoints of our list here. However, the middle figure in the wedding hymn is a Gandharva – not a good functional match for Varuṇa, or Varuṇa and Mitra, here. As I suggest in the art. cit., the Third Pressing, in which the Wife has a major role, with simulated sexual contact with the gods, is dedicated to the Ādityas, whose two principal gods are Varuṇa and Mitra – this ritual episode may be alluded to here, but see also below.

There is much discussion about the derivation of the agent noun *anvartitā́*: to *ánu √ṛ(t)* (the Pp. interpr.) or *ánu √vṛt* with simplification of **anuvart-* (see Old, Ge n. 2c, etc.)? Old favors *√ṛ(t)* and is fld. by Ge, Tichy (Nom. ag. 126, flg. I. Eichner-Kühn), with the sense

‘demand-er back’ (Zurückforderer). But since the few passages adduced for this lexeme are late and seem divergent in sense, I favor the connection with √*vṛt* (as does Re, but he thinks it means “consentant”). The lexeme *ánu* √*vṛt* is reasonably well attested in both RV and AV and means ‘follow after, escort’, which fits the context well. The AV has a future *ánvartiṣye* in a wedding context (Ś XIV.1.56=P XVIII.6.4). The form is phonologically ambiguous in the same way as ours, but Wh (AV ad loc.) and Kim (Index verborum s.v. *vart*) both interpret as **ánu vartiṣye*. AVŚ XIV.1.56 *idáṃ tád rūpáṃ yád ávasta yóṣā, jāyā́ṃ jijñāse mánasā cárantīm / tā́m ánvartiṣye sákhibhir návagvaiḥ, ká imā́n vidvā́n ví cacarta pā́sān* Wh “This [is] that form in which the young woman dressed herself; I desire to know with [my] mind the wife moving about; I will go after her [/escort her? swj] with nine-fold comrades: who, knowing, unloosened these fetters?” The “fetters” in d are “the fetters of Varuṇa” (mentioned explicitly in the two flg. vss., XIV.1.57–58), with which the bride is briefly bound at the beginning of the wedding ceremony, before being released to marriage. That Varuṇa is the *anvartitā́* in our vs. seems significant.

I render *mitráḥ* here as ‘ally’, an appositive to *váruṇaḥ*, rather than as the god Mitra (contra the standard tr.), primarily for this reason: i.e., that the idiom *ánu* √*(v)ṛt* is also found in a passage that links Varuṇa (alone) with the wife (*jāyā́*). It is also the case that there’s a singular verb and agent noun, though that is not so strong an argument, since singular nouns in series can take singular verbs.

X.109.3: This vs. has received a number of (over-)elaborate interpr., bending it to fit the purāṇic story (or whatever scenario the interpr. favors). I cannot engage with these in detail; see the extensive disc. of, e.g., Old, Ge, and Doniger (275–77). Suffice it to say that the supposed plot that those interpr. see does some violence to what is actually in the text.

In my interpr. the vs. concerns the Patnī’s activity on the ritual ground. Her presence there is announced in b. In pāda a the standard interpr. assume that the hand belongs to someone else, but I take it to be hers (see pāda-final *asyā(ḥ)*). Only she can touch and transfer the ritual substance from the earthly to the divine realm. Her exclusive role in this transfer is further treated in pāda c: she does not allow a proxy or messenger to be sent; she must do it herself. As I say in the art. cit., the mid. perfect *tasthe* with dat. inf. may go too easily into idiomatic Engl. (“stand for” = “allow, permit”), though Ge’s “gestattete” is sim. (Kü doesn’t treat this passage.) Note the double dative infinitival phrase *dūtā́ya prahyè*.

I do not have a particularly good explanation for pāda d. I do not think it has to do with tension and hostility between the two varṇas, brahmans and kṣatriyas, although I think this vs. probably contributed to the reorientation of this expanded hymn in the AV to just this issue. (See n. 54 in my 2016 art. for disc.) Varṇa-consciousness barely exists in most of the RV, though it does begin to surface in the later parts of the text. But even there the relation between king and priest is generally one of cooperation and complementarity. I think such a situation may be depicted here: she is the wife of the Brahman, quite possibly a/the priestly sacrificer, but the correct performance of the sacrifice ensures the continued successful function of the overarching social and political structures – the kingdom and its ruler. Note also that the AV Brahmacārin hymn contains a very similar statement: AVŚ XI.5.17=AVP XVI.54.7 *brahmacáryeṇa tápasā rā́jā rāṣṭrám ví rakṣati* “By brahmacarya and by fervor the king protects his kingdom.” In both cases kingship is supported by the characteristic activity of priestly personnel.

X.109.4: This vs. continues the celebration of the Patnī's critical role in the sacrifice. It is a canny move on the part of the ritual innovators who recently introduced the Wife into the sacrifice to ascribe these praises of the Wife to "the ancient gods and Seven Seers" (*devā́ḥ ... pū́rve, saptarṣáyaḥ*), thus providing this innovation with a supposedly primordial pedigree.

My interpr. of what they say is quite different from the standard, turning on a different understanding of the hapax *durdhā́-* (besides the standard tr. and comm., see also Scar 252). It is generally taken to mean 'disorder'; by contrast I interpr. it as 'difficult to place'. It is not that she causes trouble in heaven, but that she performs difficult and dangerous tasks in the sacrifice – particularly the preparation of the sacrificial animal – and transfers the perilous material to the divine world.

The standard interpr. also must take *úpanītā* as 'led *away*' (Wh [AVŚ V.17.6] 'led away' [based on the *ápanītā* of the Ś text; see below], Don 'taken away'), referring to her supposed abduction. But *úpa* doesn't mean 'away', but its opposite 'up to, near'; moreover *úpa* √*nī* has a technical idiomatic meaning: 'initiate'. Given the presence of *brahmacārín-* in the next vs. (5a), it is difficult to believe that this technical meaning wasn't in the poet's and audience's minds, since already in the AV the Brahmacārin undergoes Upanayana; see, e.g., AVŚ XI.5.3. Here I think both the additive meaning 'led near' and the technical 'initiated' are meant: the Wife is led into intimate association with the personnel and activities of the sacrifice, and she is also initiated as a performer in her own right. (In śrauta ritual the Patnī undergoes Dīkṣā along with her husband.) Note that both AV versions (Ś V.17.6, P IX.15.6) have instead *ápanītā*, which of course supports an abduction narrative, but loses the ritual richness of the RV, which I would also judge to be the more difficult reading.

X.109.5: For another take on this vs., which I find no more plausible than the others, see HPS (B+I 120–22).

This vs. contains the only occurrence of *brahmacārín-* (or *brahmacárya-*) in the RV. As noted above, I think the poet who lobbies so effectively for the new ritual Patnī in this hymn also infuses the hymn with hints of the Brahmacārin. I also think the poet was well aware of the literal sense of the compound 'practicing *bráhman*', in addition to its newly developed technical sense. This is immediately evident in the double etymological figure that opens the vs.: *brahmacārī́ carati véviṣad víṣaḥ*. Here I think that *carati* functions as an auxiliary, reinforcing the iterative value of the participle *véviṣat* ("keeps constantly laboring"). If *brahmacārī́* is interpr. in its literal sense, this would mean that the priest/poet, who produces formulations, just keeps doing what he's always been doing in the ritual, while the newly introduced Patnī, the "wife of the formulation" (*brahmajāyā́-*), a possible interpr. of that cmpd. (see 2016 art.), brings novelty to the ritual. If *brahmacārī́* is interpr. in its new idiomatic sense, the student keeps accomplishing the many types of cosmic deeds attributed to him in the AV Brahmacārin hymn.

The second pāda is difficult, in part because *ékam* can be interpr. in diametrically opposed ways: does he become *one* limb of the gods, of which there are potentially more, or the *single* limb of the gods, of which there are no more? As is often my technique, I think it can be interpreted as both. On the one hand, if *brahmacārī* refers here to the standard ritual formulator, the priest-poet, pāda b may be pointing out that he is now (just) one limb of the gods; the new Patnī is another, and together they will form a more effective team. This could also be true if *brahmacārī* refers to the student (forming a polarized pair with the Patnī), but I think "the single/only limb" interpr. fits the student better – if we're allowed a more expansive interpr. of *áṅga-* 'limb'. In the wedding hymn X.85.30 the sg. *áṅgam* clearly refers to the bridegroom's

penis; the designation "one/single limb" would make that referent even clearer here. Of course, it's a shocking paradox to call the chaste student "the penis of the gods" – but the kind of shock a RVic audience would enjoy. Moreover, the Brahmacārin is credited with an astounding and unambiguous sexual act in the AV Brahmacārin hymn: Ś XI.5.12 = P XVI.154.2 *bṛhác chépó 'nu bhū́mau jabhāra / brahmacārī́ siñcati sā́nau rétaḥ pṛthivyā́m* "He "bore down" his lofty penis on the earth; the Brahmacārin pours semen on the back, on the earth." (On the sexual idiom *ánu √bhṛ* see my 1981 "A Vedic sexual pun: *ástobhayat, anubhartrī*, and RV I.88.6" [*Acta Orientalia* 42 (1981[82]) 55-63].) It seems that the very fervor of his chastity makes him prodigiously sexual.

I don't quite know what to do with pāda c, which has provided (weak) support for the abduction narrative – though I now have a few new ideas.

The first problem is *téna*: this is ordinarily (incl. in the publ. tr.) taken as an instrument instrumental: "by/with him," referring to the Brahmacārin; it could alternatively be an instr. of accompaniment: "... discovered the wife along with him" or "along with him, Bṛhaspati discovered ..." Or it could be an adverbial "in this way ..." None of these possibilities is particularly compelling, though I now weakly favor the last.

The subject *bṛ́haspátiḥ* is, not surprisingly, generally taken as the god, but I now wonder. I think it is a multifaceted pun: in the RV this well-attested compound is doubled by the less common, but more transparent *bráhmaṇas-páti-*, and the genitive 1st members of these compounds could easily be replaced by the stem form *brahma-*, which we find in *brahma-jāyā́-*. In other words *bṛ́haspáti-* here can count as the husband of the pair, a putative **brahma-páti-* – and he also can be taken as a different realization of *brahma-cārín-* 'practicing formulations', which begins the vs. In other words, I now think that *bṛ́haspátiḥ* here designates not a god, but the husband of the *brahmajāyā́-*, from whom he has been separated during her activity on the ritual ground. He now finds her: this is the beginning of the "return" of the Brahman's wife, which will occupy the next vs. And just as Soma was the first to give her back in 2a, here she is led to her husband by Soma.

The simile in d is interpretable if *juhū́-* 'ladle / tongue' is taken as standing for Agni (see VI.66.10 for "tongues of fire"). It is a glancing allusion to the myth of Agni's flight from his ritual role and rediscovery by the gods.

X.109.6: The vs. corresponding to vs. 2 in the outer ring of this omphalos hymn; see publ. intro. and art. cit.

As disc. in the cited article, "kings" in the plural is almost never used of mortal kings in the RV, but only of the Ādityas. As the deities of the Third Pressing, their particular participation here is understandable. Once again, the scenario of the supposed hostility between the kṣatriya and brāhmaṇa varnas is subverted by closer attention to the actual text.

On *adaduḥ* (a), *daduḥ* (d), and the gapped verb of b, see the art. cit. There is no justification for the modal interpr. of b and d in the standard tr., and I take them all as preterital. Everyone involved in the ritual, gods and mortals alike, have restored the wife to her husband after her ritual activities.

X.109.7: This vs. forms a ring with the first, particularly in their shared *-kilbiṣá-* – an esp. nice example of a ring, because the second example cancels out the first: the offense has been expiated. On the possible ref. to the Avabhṛtha or "final bath," taken by the Sacrificer and his Wife in śrauta ritual, see art. cit.

The standard tr. have some trouble with the instr. *devaíḥ*; they must assume that the mortals make expiation with the help of the gods. But in my interpr. the gods are equally guilty of the offense of separating the wife from her husband and participate in the expiation.

The last hemistich of the hymn seems only loosely connected to it, expressing the good results that the participants in the sacrifice, both gods and men, share (c). I see no reason to bring Viṣṇu into d (like Ge, e.g.). Although *urugāyá-* does elsewhere modify Viṣṇu, he is not the only typical referent. Instead the form often refers to the wide space so prized by Vedic people – see VI.28.4, where cows wander *urugāyám ábhayam* "(space) that is wide-ranging and free of fear," and the repeated passage VII.35.15=X.65–66.15, where the gods are asked to grant *urugāyám* to us. In neither case is Viṣṇu appropriate.

Note the non-standard gerund suffixes on *kṛtvī* and *bhaktvā́ya*.

X.110 Āprī

A fairly unremarkable Āprī hymn: an 11-verse version with Tanūnapāt in vs. 2 (like I.188, III.4, VII.2, IX.5) instead of Narāśaṃsa (like II.3, V.5, X.70). I.13 and I.142 have both, with Tanūnapāt in vs. 2 and Narāśaṃsa in vs. 3.

X.110.1: On the phrase *mánuṣo duroṇé*, see comm. ad X.104.4, also (for *duroṇé*) X.11.2.

On the accent on *váha* in *ā́ ca váha*, see comm. ad I.74.6. At least functionally we do not seem to be dealing with subordinating *ca*, *pace* JSK (DGRV I.243–44) and others.

X.110.2: On the phrase *pathá ṛtásya yā́nān*, see Re's extensive disc. (EVP XIV.119). To my mind we are dealing with the crossing of two expressions: on the one hand, *ṛtásya pánthā-* "path(s) of truth" is a common expression (I.46.11, 136.2, etc. etc.); on the other, the phrase *ṛtáṃ yaté* "to the one going to / following the truth" (though with the part. of √*i*, not √*yā*) is a fairly common pāda-ending, incl. in the Tanūnapāt vs. in the Āprī hymn I.188.2. I think they're combined here, with "truth" as goal supplanted by the genitive. This seems easier than assuming a decomposed **ṛta-yāna-* [no accent given] as Re does.

Pāda d contains a *ca* whose coordinating role is not immed. clear. JSK (DGRV I.223) plausibly explains it as connecting the *kṛṇuhi* clause of cd with the *svadayā* clause of ab, but preceded by the heavy participial phrase that occupies all of c. That phrase itself contains an *utá* conjoining the acc. objs. *mánmāni* and *yajñám*.

X.110.5: Pāda c consists of a single voc. phrase, with a single accent, on the initial syllable of *dévīḥ*.

X.110.6: On *suṣváyantīḥ* see comm. on the other RVic occurrence of this stem in VII.36.6, as well as my *-áya-* book (pp. 52–53), where I argue that our form is based directly on VII.36.6.

X.110.7: I take *yájadhyai* as a purpose inf. with *mímānā*, with the two Hotars as subjects of both (so also Re). Ge (fld. by Keydana, Inf. 61) instead construes it as a predicated inf. with "I" as supplied subj. ("... will ich verehren"). But in other Divine Hotar vss. in Āprī hymns, it's the Hotars who sacrifice; they aren't sacrificed to. Cf. I.13.8=I.142.8=I.188.7 *yajñáṃ no yakṣatām imám* and II.3.7 *yakṣataḥ ... / devā́n yájantau*. Acdg. to his n. 7b, he bases his tr. on VII.2.7 *mánye vām ... yájadhyai*, but that is better interpr. as "I think you are to perform the sacrifice," rather than his "... euch gedenke ich zu verehren." In neither interpr. is there a finite verb in this

vs. In this type of "mentioning" context a finite verb does not seem necessary, but the vs. does contain three pres. participles that could be taken as predicated: *mímānā* (b), *pracodáyantā* (c), and *diśántā* (d).

The "dwelling of Manu" (1a) has now been further specified as the "sacrifice of Manu."

A more significant piece of chaining is *prācī́nam ... pradíśā* (d), which picks up the same phrase in 4a. In 4 the "east-facing" substance was the barhis; here it is the light (*jyótiḥ*), which is presumably the ritual fire (so Ge n. 7d, referring to "all commentaries"). The root noun cmpd *pradíś-* occurs three times in this hymn, twice as instr. (4a, 7d), once as loc. (11c). This stem also has several different senses, rather like its English counterpart 'direction' – either as a geographical term, leading ultimately to its use for quarters or regions, or as an instruction, order, or command (see Scar 222–23). In our 4a it is clearly the former, in our 11c clearly the latter. In my opinion the one in our vs. is a modulation from one to the other and can be interpr. in both senses. Ge seems to ignore the strong phraseological agreement between 4a and 7d and interpr. *pradíśā* only in the 'instruction' sense ("mit ihrer Weisung," versus 4a "in der Richtung der Erde"). My tr. is meant to capture both: the Hotars direct the fire towards the earth's eastern direction, just as the barhis was arranged in 4a, but they also do so at their own direction.

X.110.8: On Iḍā's instruction of Manu, see I.31.11 *íḷām akṛṇvan mánuṣasya śāsanīm* "They made I. the instructor of M."

Barhis as *syoná-* for gods to sit on returns from 4a, d.

X.110.9: The verb *ápiṃśat* picks up *śukra-píś-* in 6d.

The 2nd hemistich echoes and scrambles 3cd: *hótā ... yakṣi iṣitó yájīyān* matched by our *... hotar iṣitó yájīyān ... yakṣi*.

X.110.10: I take the Lord of the Forest, the Butcher, and Agni as three different entities because of the pl. verb *svadantu*. In II.3.10 the three figures appear in different pādas and have different associated verbs. Ge merges the Butcher and Agni, but doesn't mention the number of the verb.

The phrase in 2b *mádhvā samañján svadayā* is picked up and parceled out here: *samañján* (a) *... svádantu mádhunā* (d). In b *pā́thaḥ* echoes *patháḥ* of 2a, though they are entirely different words.

X.110.11: More echoes: *vy àmimīta yajñám* recalls 7b *mímānā yajñám*. On *pradíśi* see comm. ad vs. 7. And *adantu* (d) plays on *svádantu* 10d.

X.111 Indra

On the hymn's reflections on the connection between poetry and deeds, esp. in vss. 1–4, see the publ. intro.

The hymn is overstuffed with *hí*'s, esp. at the beginning, often without clear function: 1d, 2a. 3b, also 6a. The publ. tr.'s attempt to render them all as causal may be misguided.

X.111.1: The interpr. of pāda b is somewhat open-ended: does *yáthā-yathā* mean "exactly as ..." (so, e.g., JSK, "Āmreḍitas ... [JAOS 123 (2003): 785]) or, its opposite, "in whatever way" (which Klein also allows as possible for this passage)? I favor the latter, in part because it seems a loose paraphrase of the poet's patronymic Vairūpa 'having many/different forms', in part because the beginning of the hymn seems to celebrate the range of poetic possibilities.

There are several different ways to take *satyaíḥ ... kṛtébhiḥ*; Ge's anodyne "durch seine wahrhaften Taten" is perhaps the most obvious, with *satyá-* modifying nominalized *kṛtá-*; Lü (508–9) flips the grammatical values, with *kṛtá-* modifying nominalized *satyá-*: "gemachten Wahrheiten," which he further specifies as Satyakriyas (truth-formulations). This seems to me to go too far, esp. as it's *ṛtá-* that participates in RVic truth-formulations. My interpr. reads *kṛtá-* twice, both as nominalized 'deed' and as an adj. predicating *satyá-* ("made real"). As indic. in the publ. intro., I think the point is that poets by celebrating Indra's deeds give them reality – this is a minor variant on the IE "imperishable fame" theme that pervades archaic IE poetry: it is not enough to *do* something heroic; it needs to be enshrined in words, words artful enough to last. That Indra, the hero (*vīráḥ*), realizes this is shown by pāda d.

X.111.2: HPS (B+I 229–30) takes this vs. as a depiction of the Vala myth, with the "cows" (*góbhiḥ*) being the cows trapped in the cave, not (with Ge n. 2b) hymns. Interpr. the vs. in this way helps account for its place in the hymn and esp. the first pāda (with *hí*). Since in the Vala myth Indra functions as poet, opening the cave by his true and well-formulated speech, he understands the power of the ritual speech produced by human poets. I now take pāda a as further explaining 1d. In 1cd it is said that the poets make Indra's deeds real (in poetry) *because* (*hí*) "he is known to long for song." Pāda 2a explains Indra's particular penchant for songs: *because* (*hí*) his own hymnic vision (*dhītíḥ*) "flashed out" effectively when he was positioned at the Vala cave, just as the same type of vision flashes out from the human poets on the ritual ground with the same efficacy.

In pāda b I would now replace "the cows [=Dawns/hymns]" with "the cows (from the Vala cave)."

Indra's mother is identified as a *gṛṣṭí-* in IV.18.10, the only occurrence of this word in the RV, just as the metronymic *gārṣṭeyá-* only appears here. The tr. "heifer" is a bit misleading, since the usual def. of the English word is "a young cow, esp. one that has not given birth to a calf." But "young cow" is flat, and "heifer" conveys the tone better, I think.

Pāda c is a clearer version of pāda a; that is, it depicts Indra's action at the Vala cave. The presence of *ráveṇa* is a tipoff, because this word is almost always used in a Vala context for the roar that breaks open the cave (e.g., IV.50.5 *valáṃ ruroja ... ráveṇa*).

I interpr. *mahā́nti cíd ...* as a concessive nominal clause, in great part because *purū́ṇi cíd* in 4c invites the same treatment; both modify *rájāṃsi*. See also *mahī́ṃ cíd* in 5c.

Acdg. to Kü (503), the indic. pf. of √*vyac* is only stative presential, and he so tr. this passage. But in this mythological context a presential interp. seems strained; see HPS's preterital "... hat er ganz umspannt."

X.111.3: My interpr. of the first pāda differs considerably from the standard. In my view (see publ. intro.) it asserts the crucial role of poetry in Indra's self-fashioning: he knows about his deeds and powers from hearing about them in praise poetry. Contra the Pp (and all standard interpr.) I take the Saṃhitā form *śrútyā* as standing for abl. *śrútyās*, not dat. *śrútyai*. (For abl.-gen. in *-yās* to fem. short *i*-stems, see, e.g., *yuvatyā́s* to *yuvatí-*).

The referent of *asyá* 'of this' is, broadly, the Indra mythology related in the first vss. as well as what is to come.

It's a good thing that *he* knows it, because the rest of the vs. is deeply puzzling to the rest of us. HPS (229 n. 106) claims that it also concerns the Vala myth. Although this would be both convenient and make sense, since 2 and 4ab are Vala vss., I see no points of contact – although

there's a cow, it's singular, and the Vala cows are plural. As Old and Ge (n. 3c) point out, pāda c, with *ménā-* and a cow, is reminiscent of the likewise deeply puzzling I.121.2, and I have interpr. our passage in light of my own interpr. of that vs. (see comm. ad loc.). Here I think the context is (the time of) dawn, and the *menā̆* and the cow are both Dawn, who becomes Indra's consort. The dawn context is set in pāda b, where Indra becomes the "path-maker" for the sun, implying a time before the sun rises and begins its journey across heaven.

The second hemistich must continue pāda b, both thematically and syntactically, because the accent on *bhúvat* in c can best be explained if it's still under the domain of *hí* in b -- so Old, implicitly contra Ge; alternatively Scar (147) makes the first part of c an unmarked subord. cl ("Wenn ..."). In this hemistich I read both *góḥ* and *pátiḥ* twice. I first take *góḥ* as abl., in the phrase "making a wife from a cow," and then as gen. with *pátiḥ*: "husband of the cow." In both cases the cow is Dawn. *pátiḥ* is positioned between two adjacent genitives and can also be read with flg. *diváḥ* as "lord of heaven" (for Indra as "lord of heaven" see VIII.13.8, 98.4–6). This is a bit tricky, but the overall interpr. makes at least a bit more sense than the others.

X.111.4: The first hemistich returns to the Vala myth, signaled most clearly by the presence of the Aṅgirases. Although there are no other unambiguous exx. of *arṇavá-* 'flood' referring to Vala (*pace* Ge n. 4a and HPS [Vedisch *Vrata* 47 n. 84], the occurrence in VIII.40.5 is not at all clear), but several occurrences of *udadhí-* 'water-holder, reservoir' probably do refer to Vala (X.67.5, possibly VII.94.12), and it is not difficult to think of Vala as a reservoir of cows/dawns/waters, and by some semantic fiddling as a flood: "flood" – i.e., the contained (cows/dawns/waters) -- can be used to name their container, the Vala cave.

The statement "Indra by his greatness confounded the commandments of the great Flood [=Vala]" (*índro mahnā̆ maható arṇavásya vratā̆mināt*) is quite extraordinary in a RVic context. *vratá*s are otherwise almost the exclusive province of gods, esp Varuṇa. (On *vratá-* in general see HPS, Vedisch *Vrata*, and for important adjustments to HPS's views, Brereton, Ādityas, 69–81.) When construed with √*mī* (+/- *ā̆* or *prá*), the syntagm is almost always negated: "he/they [generally mortals] do/did *not* confound the *vrata*(s)"; in the few positive occurrences the subjects who do confound the *vrata*s [again mortals] are inviting divine punishment, though often hoping for mercy. Acdg to HPS, who discusses this vs. at length (Vedisch *Vrata* 46–47), this is the only place in which a "widergöttlich" being has *vrata*s. He reasonably asks what Vala's *vrata*s might be and concludes, also reasonably, that it is the lie (*drúh-*), untruth (*ánṛta-*). The ascription of *vrata*s to Vala is a remarkable index of his power, almost an indication that his power is equivalent to that of the gods, a sense encouraged by assigning greatness to both Indra and Vala in this vs. (*mahnā̆ mahatáḥ*). If this power is linked to Untruth as the gods' is to Truth, the picture is almost like that of the uneasy Avestan balance between those two forces – a hint of Zoroastrian-type dualism that does not get further developed in Vedic. Here, happily, Indra's own greatness is sufficient to overcome great Vala's *vrata*s, but the fact that the verb is *amināt* (per Pp, or possibly *ā̆-amināt*), whose subjects in this formula are otherwise disobedient mortals, is unsettling; it casts Indra in the role of a less powerful being challenging the implicitly legitimate commandments of an implicitly legitimate and powerful authority.

The lexeme *ní* √*tan* does not otherwise occur in the RV, but in the AV and early Saṃhitās there are various plant names based on it, presumably meaning 'stretch(ing) down' of roots. See Griffiths's disc. ad AVP VII.5.6. I take c to concern the fixation of the earthly realms. On *purū̆ṇi cíd* see comm. ad 2d, also 5c.

The final word of d, *satyátātā*, may form a ring with *satyaíḥ* in 1c, bringing to a close the section of the hymn concerned with the intertwining of divine deeds and poetry. The form is universally taken (incl. by the publ. tr.) as an instr. to *satyátāt-*. Acdg. to the publ. tr., Indra performed these deeds by means of the realization provided by their poetic encapsulation, by the Aṅgirases (as in the publ. tr.) or in general. An alternative analysis could start with the stem **satyátāti-* (attested 1x in the RV, but as an unaccented voc.), which would then be in the loc. (as often with *-tāti-* stems; e.g., *devátātā*, *sarvátātā*). In this case it would mean "buttressed their buttress in reality / in poetic realization." The two are equally likely (or unlikely). We should also consider *satyátātā* in conjunction with the unexpressed, but implied, linkage of Vala and his *vrata*s to Untruth, discussed immed. above. Under this interpr. Indra did his various deeds *by means of* truth/reality or rooted the realms and buttressed their buttress *in* truth/reality (depending on whether the *-tāt-* or *-tāti-* stem is selected).

X.111.5: This vs. is a bit of a mythological grab bag; one of its points, esp. in the first pāda, may be to reestablish the superior power of Indra after the destabilization in the previous vs., 4ab. The first hemistich echoes III.31.8. Bl (RV Reps, ad III.31.8) dismisses our vs. with characteristic acidity: "[III.31.8] has furnished material for a hackneyed, commonplace stanza, in which the repeated pāda is varied insipidly, to wit X.111.5. ... the overshrewd thought of an epigonal poet ..." It is always bracing to read Bl at his most censorious, but his judgments need not always be accepted.

Pāda d is marked by the heavy etym. figure *cāskambha ... kámbhanena skábhīyān*, where, cleverly, each word begins with a different consonant.

X.111.6: Another etym. fig.: *vṛtrahā́ vṛtrám*.

The verb *ástar* can be either 2nd or 3rd sg.; Ge opts for the latter, while I do the former. It doesn't really matter: it's a modulation form between the 3rd sgs. of vs. 5 (ending with *cāskambha*) and the 2nd sgs. of 6cd (*jagantha .. abhavaḥ*).

Pāda b lacks a verb and can be construed either with pāda a (so publ. tr.) or c (Ge). Again it doesn't really matter.

X.111.7: The first hemistich is relatively straightforward, the second bristling with difficulties.

The only real question in ab is whose *ketú*s are at issue – the sun's or the dawns'? Though Ge (see also JS, Root nouns 41) takes the beacons to be the sun's (with *asya* dependent on *ketávaḥ*), I think they are actually the dawns'. Although *ketú-* can be associated with both the sun (e.g., X.37.1 ... *ketáve ... sū́ryāya ...*) and the dawns (e.g., VIII.43.5, X.78.7, 91.5 *uṣásām iva / ná ketávaḥ*), it is my impression that the connection with dawns is more common. I therefore take *asya* as limiting *citrā́m ... rā́m* "glittering gift," referring to the sun's light or even to the sun itself.

My real departure from the Ge and Old interpr. comes with c. They take c and d as antithetical clauses concerning the not-yet-risen sun (c) and the unknowable goal of the sun once set (d). Flg. Ludwig, they both take *yát* in c as a neut. pres. part. to √*i* (construed with *ā́* "coming here"), complementary to *(púnar) yatáḥ* "going away again." The *yát* in c is therefore not (or not primarily) the subordinating conj.; eliminating an overt subordinator requires the accent on *dadṛśé* to be explained: Old suggests antithetical accent; Ge (n. 7cd) adds the possibility of haplology **yád yád*. All of this seems plausible and I am almost convinced. The resulting tr. would be "(When) the heavenly body coming here from heaven [or, "the day's heavenly body,"

with Ge's "Tagesgestirn," construing *diváḥ* with *nákṣatram* in the meaning 'day'] is not (yet) seen, no one knows about its going (away) again." I now consider this a possible alt., though I don't seen how pāda c furnishes the logical basis for d, and the position of *ná* creates difficulties (see below).

The publ. tr. reflects a different construal of pāda c – as a rel. cl. appositive to the "glittering gift" of b, with the rel. prn. attracted to the neut. gender of the internal referent *nákṣatram* (from the fem. of *citrā́m ... rā́m* in b). Pāda d is then a separate clause. By this interpr. *dadṛśé* has its accent because it is in a subord. cl. I would now, however, tr. the verb as "appears," rather than preterital "appeared," given the usual presential use of the middle pf. of √*dṛś* (Kü 233).

This interpr. leaves pāda-final *ná* out of the rest of c and is the most problematic part of my interpr.: I take it as an emphatic expletive, anticipating the next pāda with its own neg. (*nákiḥ*) and its own emphatic (*addhā́*). I recognize the ad hoc nature of this interpr., but pāda-final *ná* is problematic for everyone. Ge (7cd) weighs both "wie" and "nicht" (both to be construed within pāda c) and decides for the latter – on apparently reasonable grounds, because simile-marking *ná* seems essentially excluded from final position (see comm. ad VIII.76.1, X.21.1), as he himself noted elsewhere. But as it turns out, pāda-final negative *ná* is also on shaky ground; see immed. flg. disc.

To aid our interpr. we need to make a detour to a general consideration of pāda-final *ná* in the RV. I have made a complete (so I hope) collection of pāda-final *ná*, which is extremely rare, especially if *caná* passages are excluded. For reference I patch in the repertoire of *caná* passages: pāda-final *caná* (12x): II.23.5 *ná ... ná ... kútaś caná*; V.34.5 *ná ... caná*; VI.54.9 *ná ... kádā caná*; VII.82.7 *...ná ... kútaś caná*; VIII.19.6 *ná ... kútaś caná*; VIII.23.15 *ná ... caná*; IX.69.6 *ná ... kíṃ caná*; X.39.11 *ná ... kútaś caná*; X.48.5 *ná ... kádā caná*; X.62.9 *ná ... káś caná*; X.85.3 *ná ... káś caná*; X.152.1 *ná ... kádā caná*.

We can now consider possible examples of simile-marking *ná* and negative *ná* in that position. There is one, seemingly secure, ex. of pāda-final *ná* in a conventional simile (VII.68.8). X.95.3 also has a pāda-final 'like', but it occurs in a truncated simile and, more importantly, in Purūravas's disordered speech and can serve as an index of how his mania has affected his syntax (see comm. ad loc.). The pāda formatting in Lub in the metrically complex hymn X.105.3 appears to provide another ex.: *ápa yór índraḥ pā́paja ā́ márto ná*, but the hemistich continues *śaśramāṇó bibhīvā́n*, and the correct pāda configuration is clearly *ápa yór índraḥ pā́paja, ā́ márto ná śaśramāṇó bibhīvā́n*, with 8 12 (so HvN), with *ná* safely inside the pāda.

There are even fewer secure pāda-final *ná*s in negative than in simile-marking usage, and they all have, as it were, extenuating circumstances. In IV.13.5 [=14.5] *ánāyato ánibaddhaḥ kathā́yáṃ nyàṅṅ uttānó 'va padyate ná* "Not held firm, not tied down -- how does this one not fall down, head over heels?" the *ná* echoes the two negated adjectives that open the hemistich, creating a chiasmic #*án ... án ... ná*, and it also poses a negative question, which may have affected its position. In X.49.10 *aháṃ tád āsu dhārayaṃ yád āsu ná, deváś caná tváṣṭā́dhārayad rúśat* "I held fast in them that which the god Tvaṣṭar never held fast in them: the gleaming ...," the pāda-final *ná* (if so it is) is clause-internal in a rel. cl. that straddles the pāda break, with *caná* doubling it in the following pāda. Moreover, pāda b is metrically problematic (see comm. ad loc.), and it highly probable that *ná* opens that pāda (#*ná deváś caná ...*) rather than ending pāda a, and so this ex. can be scrapped. X.129.7 contains the famous final phrase *yádi vā dadhé yádi vā ná*, which is both syntactically and metrically incomplete: the unusual final *ná* draws attention to this principled lack of closure.

In short, save for IV.13.5 there are no examples of a pāda-final negative *ná* that *ends* a complete clause and is construed within it – the function that the Ge interpr. of our pāda c requires. Since there is no body of such usage to set against my (admittedly unique) interpr. of *ná* here as an emphatic anticipation of the next, negative clause, I cautiously favor my interpr. in the publ. tr.

For further on the avoidance of final *ná* and an accounting of the few actual examples, see my recent "Penultimate *ná* 'like' in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism" (ECIEC 2024), to appear in a forthcoming Fs..

With Ge and Old, however, I do consider pāda d to concern the unknowable whereabouts of the sun after setting.

X.111.8: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. serves as a sort of semantic pivot, with the unidentified females of most of the first hemistich (gen. pl. *āsām* [a], *yā́ḥ* [b]) seeming to continue the subject of the Dawns in vs. 7, but identified instead as waters by the last word of the hemistich (*ā́paḥ*), an identity hinted at by the immed. preceding verb *sasrúḥ* 'flowed'. This transitions us to the Vṛtra myth, which is overt in vs. 9. Since the action in pāda a is characteristic of Dawns – the daily passage of one after the other – the introduction of waters in b is even more unexpected.

The first pāda of this vs. also responds indirectly to the end of the preceding vs.: we do not know about the sun's going away, but the subjects of 8a "have gone into the distance" (*dūrám ... jagmuḥ*). The certainty of our knowledge of their trajectory seems signaled by *kíla* (see the same particle in 3a), in contrast to the radical *un*certainty of 7d (*nákir addhā́ nú veda*). Uncertainty returns in the second hemistich of this vs., however.

A slight adjustment to the tr. to "the first ones ..." would avoid the apparent number mismatch of "the first ... have gone."

The second hemistich shows a different transition, from 3rd ps. (fem. gen. pl. *āsām*, like 8a) in c to 2nd ps. in d (*vaḥ*), by way of *ā́paḥ*, which must be voc. here, but was nom. in 8b.

X.111.10: With Ge I take *āritáḥ* with *jāráḥ* ("acknowledged as their lover"). Although it is tempting on the basis of VIII.33.5 *yáḥ pūrbhíd āritáḥ* "who is acknowledged as the stronghold-splitter" to construe *āritáḥ* with flg. *pūrbhíd*, the context favors the first alternative.

X.112 Indra

The poet's name in the heading to the publ. tr. contains a typo: his name is Prabhedana, not Prebhedana. The hymn is fairly elementary and trouble-free.

X.112.1: *vīryā́ prá bravāma* echoes the famous opening of I.32; for an even closer echo see vs. 8 below.

X.112.3: Ge (n. 3ab) suggests that ab really refers to soma, under the guise of the sun. Possible but not necessary.

X.112.5: This vs. is formally a riddle, though hardly a challenging one. The referent of both the relative (*yásya* [a]) and the two *sá*-s (c, d) is withheld till the final word: *sómaḥ*.

śátrūn is the problem here, since there is nothing that clearly governs this acc. Ge simply supplies a plausible verb (erschlugest); making use of a trick of English, I've given *cakártha* two

different senses – "do in" and "do" – for the two different accs., *śátrūn* and *anānukṛtyā́ ráṇyā*. But I doubt that √*kṛ* has the "do in" sense, and I should probably simply follow the Ge path by supplying 'conquered', 'smote', vel sim. There is another, trickier, possibility, which I think is unlikely in a hymn on this rudimentary rhetorical level, though I would certainly consider it in a more sophisticated hymn. It would be possible to read *anānukṛtyā́* with both the following acc. *ráṇyā* (as is already done) and the preceding one, *śátrūn*, in two different senses. The whole phrase would mean "made your rivals not to be emulated and did inimitable martial (deeds)." Of course, *anānukṛtyā́* is not acc. pl. masc. like *śátrūn*, but since the two objects differ in gender, it can agree with only one. I would not hesitate to suggest this interpr. in another type of hymn, but its trickiness is out of place in the plain-vanilla context of this one. For *anānukṛtyám* + √*kṛ*, see X.68.10, where it has the "inimitable (deed)" sense.

The primary sense of *raṇyá-* is 'joyous', but it also shares the martial sense of its base noun *ráṇa-* 'joy' / 'battle'; the noun is found in 10c, probably in both senses as well.

X.112.8: Like vs. 1, this vs. echoes I.32.1 *índrasya nú vīryā́ṇi prá vocam, yā́ni cakā́ra prathamā́ni vajrī́*. Our vs. has a counterpart for everything but *vajrī́* and the rel. prn., and indeed elaborates on some elements. The enclitic + voc. *te indra* matches *índrasya*; *nūnám* matches *nú*, which occurs in an expanded phrase *pūrvyā́ni ... nūnám*; *vīryā́ ... prathamā́* as a single NP matches *vīryā́ṇi* in the main cl. of I.32.1 and *prathamā́* in the rel. cl.; *prá ... prá ... vocam* with tmesis and doubled preverb corresponds to simple *prá vocam*; *kṛtā́ni* takes the place of the finite *cakā́ra* in the rel. cl. in I.32.1. It is hard not to conclude that our poet modeled this hemistich on I.32.1, or at least that both poets were working from the same template, given the various other versions, like V.29.13, 31.6.

Interestingly, given the fairly slavish imitation of I.32.1, what follows is not the Vṛtra myth, but Vala. (Perhaps I'm underestimating the skill of this poet – or at least his awareness of the poetic tradition.)

X.112.9: Indra now takes on his role as Bṛhaspati, singing open the Vala cave. See esp. pādas b and d.

The etym. figure *gaṇapate gaṇéṣu* is a variant of the formulaic *gaṇā́nām ... gaṇápatiḥ* "throng-lord of throngs" (II.23.1), with loc. instead of the standard gen. I would slightly alter the tr. here to "throng-lord among the throngs."

Note that in the flg. pāda the superlative + genitive phrase *vípratamaṃ kavī́nām* "the best *vipra* of *kavi*s" shows the virtual synonymity of the two terms, or at least their fungibility.

Strikingly the formula in pāda a just discussed cooccurs in II.23.1 with a etymological figure that is a variant on this one: II.23.1 *gaṇā́nāṃ tvā gaṇápatiṃ havāmahe kavíṃ kavīnā́m upamáśravastamam* "We call upon you, throng-lord of throngs, poet of poets possessing the utmost fame." In other words, our passage takes the two etymological figures found in II.23.1 and in the first case keeps the etym. figure but changes the case, and in the second, keeps the syntactic structure but lexically replaces one term. Perhaps I really *have* underestimated this poet.

X.112.10: In b the impv. *bodhí* can belong either to √*bhū* or √*budh*. Gr, Old, and I opt for the former, with *sákhe* a predicative voc.; Ge and Scar (99) for the latter (though Ge [n. 10b] offers the former as an alternative).

I take the double etym. figure *ráṇaṃ kṛdhi raṇakṛt* as a pun, with *ráṇa-* meaning both 'joy' and 'battle'; see *raṇyá-* in 5b and disc. there. Certainly the bahuvr. *satya-śuṣma* 'whose impetuous powers are real' suggests a martial context, since *śúṣma-* and its deriv. are common in them (e.g., VI.68.7 *yéṣāṃ śúṣmaḥ pṛ́tanāsu sāhvā́n* "whose impetuous force, victorious in battles ..."). Note that *satya-śuṣma* is a variant on *satīná-manyu-* 'whose battle fury is real' (8c).

On first glance *ábhakte ... rāyé* appear to belong together morphologically as they do semantically. But of course they don't, despite the surface agreement in endings (*-e)*: *rāyé* is a dat., *ábhakte* a loc. The lexeme *ā́ √bhaj* ordinarily takes a loc.; it is difficult to find a function for dat. *rāyé* in this cl. If we take the dat. seriously, we might tr. it as a purpose dat.: "Give us a share even in unapportioned (goods/wealth/booty), for wealth." But it may be better to follow Ge's suggestion (n. 10d) that dat. *rāyé* can substitute for the unattested loc. to this stem, here encouraged by the superficial agreement of the endings.

X.113 Indra

X.113.1: In the publ. tr. I construe *sácetasā* with the instr. *víśvebhir devaíḥ* "of one mind with all the gods," but since *sácetas-* doesn't otherwise appear with the instr., it might be better to take the instr. as an independent instr. of accompaniment: "H+E, of one mind, along with all the gods ..." The difference in sense is fairly minor, though it emphasizes the agreement between H+E.

The preverb *ánu* is fairly rare with *√av* (though see VIII.7.24, with the same obj. *śúṣmam*). My "assist" is meant to convey that they gave auxiliary aid, since Indra's *śúṣma-* is not likely to need a lot of help. As noted in the publ. intro., the model of auxiliary help continues through the hymn.

It's possible that *aít* is a sort of aux. with *kṛṇvānáḥ* "as he went on creating ...," though I prefer the publ. tr.

X.113.2: A verb needs to be supplied in pāda a; since this pāda has the same general structure as 1ab: *tám asya* GOD(S) INSTR ACC [POWER], I supply "assisted" (*ánu ... *āvat*) based on 1b *ánu ... āvatām*. Ge (n. 2ab; sim. Kü 255–56) instead supplies **avardhat*, anticipating *ávardhan* in 3d (and [not noted by Ge] serving as the corresponding transitive to *avardhata* in 1d). Either will work, but anticipating a verb almost two vss. in the future seems less likely than basing the passage on a preceding one with the same structure.

In b *dadhanvā́n* is universally interpr. as transitive (e.g., Ge "der den (Soma)stengel fliessen liess"; sim. Kü 255–56). But as disc. ad VIII.19.1, the secondary root *√dhanv* as well as the pf. part. *dadhanvā́n* (which can belong to *√dhan* [so Kü], but has been assimilated to *√dhanv*) is otherwise intrans., and the two other occurrences of *dadhanvā́n* (IX.67.2, 107.1) are definitely intrans., with soma as subject. Clearly the trans. interpr. of our passage assumes a flip of soma from subj. to obj., but I find such syntactic malleability implausible. I think it more likely that Viṣṇu runs to the plant, to prepare it for Indra. On Viṣṇu's participation in soma preparation, see, e.g., I.85.7, II.22.1, VI.17.11.

Acdg. to Ge (n. 2b), the subj. of *ví rapśate* is Indra, but since the same expression in IV.45.1 *mádhuno ví rapśate* has as its subj. a leather bag (*dṛ́tiḥ*), the plant, as a container of soma like the bag, seems more likely.

X.113.3: The infinitival phrase *śáṃsam āvíde* "to acquire a laud" may be a semi-technical expression for earning a *práśasti*, the formal praise that a king would receive for a heroic deed.

The obj. in d, *mahimā́nam indriyám*, is repeated from 1c, and *mahimā́nam* is also found in the same metrical position in 2a.

X.113.4: In contrast to the first 3 vss., in this catalogue of deeds Indra apparently operates alone.

X.113.5: Likewise in this vs.; Mitra and Varuṇa do appear in the vs., but not as helpers but as beneficiaries of Indra's actions.

In c *(d)hṛ̥ṣitáḥ* is a pun facilitated by the sandhi: the form can belong either to √*dhṛṣ* 'dare' or √*hṛṣ* 'be excited'. Old tots up passages that favor the one or the other, but surely the point is that it represents both. (The Pp. reads *dhṛṣitáḥ*, and this analysis is followed by Gr and Ge.)

In d Ge tentatively takes *dāśúṣe* as a third party, the mortal worshiper, in addition to M+V. Although it is true that the stem *dāśváṃs-* is overwhelming used of mortal worshipers, there are a limited no. of passages where it modifies a god; see disc. ad X.104.6. Since our exact phrase, *váruṇāya dāśúṣe*, is found in X.65.5, 6, separating these two datives is not indicated here. See comm. ad X.65.5.

X.113.6: My interpr. of the first hemistich diverges significantly from the standard, starting with the subject. Sāy. and Ge supply the waters, for which I see no evidence; in fact at the time the vs. takes place they are held captive by Vṛtra (pāda d) and in no position to be hastening anywhere. I favor the Maruts (as does Gr [s.v. *raṃh*]). Their presence here is signaled by *virapśínaḥ* 'teeming'. Gr and Ge take this adj. as gen. sg. modifying Indra, and admittedly the stem regularly modifies him (which must be why Ge takes Indra as subj. of *ví rapśate* in 2b). However it is also used 3x in the plural of the Maruts, each time adjacent to a form of *távas-* vel sim.: I.64.10 *táviṣībhir virapśínaḥ* #, I.87.1 *prátavaso virapśínaḥ* #, I.166.8 *tavaso virapśinaḥ* # -- just like our *táviṣībhyo virapśínaḥ* #. By my interpr. the Maruts hasten to the site of the Vṛtra battle to give their support to Indra and his powers and battle fury, hence the datives. It is well known that in some versions of the Vṛtra myth the Maruts provide such support to Indra. It is appropriate that they are characterized as "teeming," given their identity as the thunderstorm.

In c *vy ávṛścat* echoes *ávṛścat* in 4c; nicely, the use of this verb connects the Vala myth of 4a with the Vṛtra myth here. Another echo: the redupl. pres. participle acc. *bíbhratam* modifying Vṛtra and the same stem in the nom. *bíbhrat* modifying Indra in 3a.

X.113.7: As Ge points out (n. 7), this vs. presents the Indra–Vṛtra battle as a dual between two, nearly equally matched, rivals, rather than the usual one-sided slaughter of Vṛtra by all-powerful Indra. See the duals *yátamānau samīyátuḥ*, and esp. the preverb *sám*. This balanced account is reminiscent of the depiction of the same battle in the later part of the most famous account of it, in I.32, esp. vss. 12–13 (see comm. ad I.32.12).

The vs. begins ambiguously, and indeed misleadingly: since the initial rel. prn. *yā́* immediately precedes a neut. pl. expression, *vīryā̀ṇi prathamā́ni kártvā*, it is natural to read it as a neut. pl. "which heroic deeds ..." But this leads to a dead end, as there is no correspondent in the main cl. in cd. Only when we reach the second part of b do we encounter the duals that are the real referents of *yā́*, which can also be du. masc. "which two ..." The main cl. of cd does not have a resumptive pronoun (*tā́* vel sim.), but does have an implicit "the one ... the other" construction, with c devoted to Vṛtra and d to Indra. The interpr. of *yā́* as dual is Ge's (n. 7a),

though he in fact suggests reading *yā́* twice, as dual masc. and neut. pl.; Old rejects Ge's dual interpr., but this leaves us with an unresolved rel. cl.

Note that *vīryā̆ṇi prathamā́ni kártvā* is quite similar to *vīryā̆ ... prathamā́ kṛtā́ṇi* in the previous hymn (112.8), attributed to same or related poet. See comm. there.

Note also the return of *patyate* (cf. 5a). Ge interpr. d as referring to Indra's right to the first drink of soma: "ein Anrecht auf die erste Einladung (zum Soma)." I think that this is correct and my tr. is somewhat opaque. I'd now slightly alter to "over the Early Call (to soma)."

X.113.8: The "causative" *ávardhayan* opening b is in the same position as semantically and functionally identical *ávardhan* opening 3d, and the two verbs have nearly identical subjects: 3a *víśve ... marútaḥ*, 8a *víśve devā́saḥ*.

The content of the 2nd hemistich is startling and syntactically skewed – these two features are probably connected. It is stated that someone/something ate (*āvayat*) Vṛtra, with the subject unexpressed. Indra is in an oblique case, the gen. dependent on *hánmanā*, which might almost seem to exclude him as subject of "ate." But what other candidate is there? Certainly Ge (n. 8d) thinks Indra is the subject and cites the epithet *vṛtra-khādá-* 'gnawer of Vṛtra' used of Indra in III.45.2, 51.9 and of Indra's alter ego Bṛhaspati in X.65.10. However, this semi-cannibalism is not a standard part of the Indra–Vṛtra myth and seems rather shocking – though eating a snake isn't as bad as eating a being more human in form. I suggest that Indra is not specified as subj., but shunted into an oblique case, to lessen the shock. On the verb *ā́vayat* see my *-aya*-book, p. 71. The other occurrence of the verb in the RV, in VIII.45.38, is in a slangy context (see comm. ad loc.).

X.113.9: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. spells out the reciprocal partnership agreement between Indra and his mortal worshipers (ab) and then provides an example of it from the semi-mythic past (cd). The mutual aid between Indra and various gods (esp. the Maruts) earlier in the hymn provides the model for the agreement in ab. As I say in the publ. intro., the language is "labored," esp. in ab, presumably to approach legalese as closely as possible. Esp. important are the balanced forms of *sakhyá-* '(act of) comradeship / partnership'.

As for the illustrative example in cd, elsewhere in the RV it is clear that Indra eliminated Dhuni and Cumuri for Dabhīti because Dabhīti performed ritual service for Indra. See esp. VI.20.13 "Dabhīti who presses for you with the soma juices, who brings the firewood and the cooked food, along with the chants" (*... túbhyaṃ sómebhiḥ sunván, dabhī́tir idhmábhṛtiḥ pakthy àrkaíḥ*); in a nearby hymn (VI.26.6) these actions of Dabhīti's are summarized as *śraddhā́-* (pl.) 'hospitality offerings'. For detailed disc. of *śraddhā́-* as 'trust in hospitality relations', with hospitality often embodied in the ritual, see my Sacrificed Wife, 176–84. Here *śraddhā-manasyā́-* refers to Dabhīti's 'mind/thought on/of hospitality'; it is rather like the epithet of Manu in the Manu's Cups story (see SW/SW disc. just referred to), *śraddhā́-deva-* 'whose deity is hospitality'. In the cases of both Manu and Dabhīti, the hospitality is specifically that of the ritual.

The 3rd sg. mid. *śṛṇute* is the only indicative middle form to this stem with the "standard" 5th class inflection. It has passive value, like the far more common *t*-less forms *śṛṇvé*. By the time of this late hymn the *t*-less form may have gone out of style – though *śṛṇvé* is found twice elsewhere in X (though in hymns not markedly late) and *śṛṇvire* occurs in X.168.4.

X.113.10: In this, the final vs. of the hymn, the poet turns his attention to a different reciprocal relation: not between god and gods, nor god and humans, but human and human – viz., that between the poet and his patron, who is, however, not overtly referred to. The poet asks Indra for material goods (horses in this case) in exchange for the poet's praise – but the goods are not for the poet himself. Instead, they should make the poet considered to be an effective wordsmith (*máṃsai nivácanāni śáṃsan*). In other words, the unmentioned patron will receive an abundance of horses and conclude that his poet has effectively praised Indra, which roused Indra's generosity.

X.114 All Gods

On the manifold difficulties of this hymn, see publ. intro.; I have little to contribute to understanding the content, though I can tinker with phraseology and form. Re treats it (insofar as he does) in EVP XVI, not in the Viśve Devās fascicles. Old's treatment is scanty. (I have the feeling he had the same unenthusiastic reaction I have to the numerological extravagances of the hymn.) Köhler translates and discusses the whole hymn at length in his 2011 Kavi *im Ṛgveda* (110ff.). For attempts to decode the referents and especially the numerological referents, consult these standard treatments.

Although acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, the hymn is in Triṣṭubh with a single verse, 4, in Jagatī, in fact the meter is mixed Triṣṭubh and Jagatī (and worse), and the supposed Jagatī verse is itself mixed. For Jagatī pādas sprinkled through the hymn, see, e.g., 1a, 2a+b, 10d.

X.114.1: The lexeme *ví* √*āp* is found only here in the RV, but is already tolerably well attested in the AV, including in the strikingly similar passage AVŚ VIII.9.20 *kathám gāyatrī́ trivṛ́taṃ vyā̆pa* "How did *gāyatrī́* permeate the triple [*stóma*]?" (Wh) (no AVP corr.), which, however, is just as obscure.

The root affiliation of *aveṣan* is disputed. Gr assigns it to a root √*viṣ* 'sich ergiessen', separate from √*viṣ* 'toil', and he is followed by Narten (Sig.Aor. 245) and Gotō (1st Kl. 249). On this supposed root, see comm. ad I.178.2; I see no need for it. Ge instead takes it to √*vī* and tr. "sie für sich beanspruchend" (whose relationship to the standard meanings of √*vī* is opaque to me). Köhler (110–11) also takes it to √*vī* but with a sense in line with the usage of that root: "haben ... aufgespürt"; unlike other tr. he takes *divás páyaḥ* as the obj. of *aveṣan*, not *dídhiṣānāḥ*. But the existence of an *s*-aor. to √*vī* is questionable, and I see nothing against assigning this form to √*viṣ* 'toil' – at least without a clearer sense of what this vs. is about.

Assuming that *aveṣan* is an impf., it should not have the recent past sense "have toiled." I am inclined to recast the tenses of the first three pādas to "pervaded ... came ... toiled."

X.114.2: I have no idea what *nírṛtīḥ* refers to. The only other pl. to this stem in the RV (VIII.24.24) is no help.

Although I would prefer the root-noun cmpd *dīrgha-śrút-* to have active meaning, 'hearing long / afar / for a long time', in all clear cases it has the passive sense 'heard of / famed for a long time' (either from the distant past or for the foreseeable future or both), as Scar (555) interpr. it, flg. the standard view. It is therefore essentially equivalent to the bahuvr. *dīrghá-śravas-*. In this passage (far from clear!) in the publ. tr. I rendered it with my preferred tr. "who hear afar," which makes sense in context: the conveyers recognize the *nírṛtīḥ* because of their keen hearing. But I doubt that the cmpd has active sense in just this passage, and so I might emend to "the conveyors of far fame ..." Alternatively (and now, to me, preferably),

dīrghaśrútaḥ could be nom. pl. fem. and modify *nírṛtīḥ* in the previous pāda: "Three (Goddesses of?) Dissolution, of long fame ..." The logical connection between the clauses would then be stronger: the conveyors recognize the *nírṛtīḥ* because they are famous. Taking the adj. with what precedes also makes sense of the displaced *ví hí* in b, which should begin a clause. I would now substitute "Three (Goddesses of?) Dissolution of long fame reverently approach to be pointed out, for the conveyors (of songs?) recognize them."

Although this doesn't help much, it's worth noting that the same conjunction of lexical items – *nidā́na-*, *váhni-*, and multiple occurrences of *kaví-* -- is found in VI.32.2–3. For *ní cikyuḥ kaváyaḥ*, see the identical phrase in X.124.9.

X.114.3: The referent(s) in this vs. and its general purport are completely opaque to me, and I have nothing to contribute to the multiple identifications suggested by others (see esp. Ge, Re, and Th. Unters. 16, 60–63). Th favors the night sky as the overall referent and downplays (or denies) any ritual associations, but as in the rest of the hymn, it is likely that both types of referents are in play. The general view (Ge, Ober [RdR II.133]; see also the reff. in Th, p. 61 n. 3) that in the ritual realm the female referred to is the vedi seems hard to dismiss, though Th tries mightily.

X.114.4–6: These three verses have all the earmarks of a responsive omphalos -- *except* that they are not in the exact center of the hymn (and there are no clear supporting rings). The responsions associate vss. 4+5 and 5+6: see the lexical matches between 4a *ékaḥ suparṇáḥ* ... and 5ab *suparṇám ..., ékaṃ sántam*; 5 ... *kaváyaḥ ... kalpayanti / chándāṃsi ca dádhataḥ ... mimate dvā́daśa* and 6 ... *kalpayantaś, chándāṃsi ca dádhata ādvādaśám / ... vimā́ya kaváyaḥ ...* Moreover, the contrast between the 1st-person speaker with his simple mind (*pā́kena mánasā*) (4c), often a foil for the instructional enigma found in the omphalos, and the poets with their superior powers of perception and creation resonate like an omphalos. In vs. 6 the poets' *manīṣā́* 'inspired thought' implicitly improves on the poet's simple mind (*mánasā*), both built to the same root and in the same case and number.

As indicated in the publ. intro., I take these vss. as contrastive treatments of the poetic enterprise. In 4 the 1st ps. speaker, with his simple mind (*pā́kena mánasā*), saw a single eagle as a unity, while the inspired kavis (*víprāḥ kaváyaḥ*) in 5ab configure this single eagle in many ways (*bahudhā́*) with their words (*vácobhiḥ*), and by subjecting this poetic vision to strict metrical regulation (5cd–6) they create the sacrifice. The power of poetry to create and represent the multiple manifestations of the world could hardly be more clearly expressed.

As for the identity of the eagle (*suparṇá-*), it is generally taken as the sun or the sun identified with the ritual fire (Ge, Lü 299f., Köhler 112), though Th (62) opts for the moon, and other referents have been suggested (see Köhler's detailed disc.). In my opinion, the emphasis on identifying the referents (and defending the identification against others) has distracted interpr. from the more interesting depiction of how poets operate and what they provide.

X.114.4: Although acdg. to the Anukr. this verse is a Jagatī in a Triṣṭubh hymn, this is not quite accurate, as was already noted above. The second hemistich does indeed contain two Jagatī pādas, but pāda b is a standard Triṣṭubh, and pāda a has 13 syllables but a Triṣṭubh cadence.

X.114.5: The first three pādas of this vs. are standard Triṣṭubhs, but d in fact has 12 syllables (reading distracted *dᵘvā́daśa*, as is common for the numeral) and a Jagatī cadence. This is especially cute because the pāda ends ... *mimate dvā́daśa* "they measure twelve."

X.114.6: The consideration of the poets' contribution, esp. in creating the sacrifice and making it effective, continues in this vs. The role of meter, mentioned in 5c, is elaborated on in 6b, and the focus narrows to the specifically ritual. Again, there is much disc. in the sec. lit. of what exactly is going on, with a deep dive into the numerology. Although obviously to a contemporary audience the referents of the exact numbers were interpretable, I still think that too much attention has been lavished on decoding the numbers and too little on the celebration of the role of poets.

X.114.7: By my rules, *anyé* should be definite in this position: "the others ...," not with most interpr. indefinite "others ..." If Ge (n. 7a) is correct that this is a reference to the variants of the model ritual, a definite reference makes sense: the first, unnumbered one would be the model itself.

On a *tīrthá* associated with drink, see *tīrtháṃ suprapāṇám* in X.40.13 and comm. thereon; see also the "famous *tīrtha*" in IX.97.53. In the comm. there I suggest that it may refer to the place or time in the sacrifice when the Dakṣiṇās are distributed. If the hapax *ā́pnāna-* is related (however sketchily) to *ápnas-* 'property, wealth' (see AiG II.2.275–76), as is reflected in my tr. 'opulent', the same situation may be referred to here.

X.114.8: The lexeme *práti √pad* occurs in the RV only here. The standard tr. are contextual (e.g., Ge "hat ... erkannt"). Re points out that the later ritual sense of the idiom is "entamer le répons," which he hesitates to employ here, but I don't know why 'undertake, begin' would be excluded.

X.114.9: The verb of d, *ní cikāya*, echoes *ní cikyuḥ* in 2a, thus making a faint ring between the second and the penultimate verses. To underscore the match, and in keeping with Kü's (169) characterization of this perfect as presential, I would emend the tr. here to "discerns."

X.114.10: Pādas a and b seem to me contrastive, with the unidentified some / ones making an extended journey to the end of the earth, despite being stably yoked to the chariot poles. With Köhler (114) I'm inclined to see the subject as the poets, or particularly skillful poets.

In pāda c, if I am correct about the root affiliation of *aveṣan* in 1c, we may have a conceptual match. If 1c *divás páyo dídhiṣāṇā aveṣan* means (as I tr. it) "Seeking to acquire the milk of heaven, they [=gods] have toiled," then 10c *śrámasya dāyáṃ ví bhajanty ebhyaḥ* "They [=gods?] distribute the legacy of their labor to them" could depict the fulfillment of their earlier toil, with free paraphrase and lexical replacement (of 'toil' by 'labor'). But this is a long shot, since neither statement is clear.

As for the rest, it's just as baffling as the rest of the hymn.

X.115 Agni

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

X.115.1: The "two mothers" in b are of course the kindling sticks.

In c I take *yádi* as standing for **yád ī*, even though it does not precede a cons. cluster that would have encouraged redactional shortening. The form occurs right before the caesura in an opening of 5, and it seems unlikely that both syllables would be light in that position.

In the standard renderings (incl. the publ. tr.), we find a non-conjoining *ca* in c, apparently marking the beginning of the main cl. of cd after the subord. cl. that begins c. (See JSK, DGRV I.211–13, II.106 for attempts to account for its use here.) However, it is possible to assign it its usual conjoining function if we take the *ádhā ca nú* clause as parallel to what precedes, with both under the domain of *yádi* : "when the udderless one has begotten him and then he has waxed strong ..." This double *yádi* cl. would depend on the main cl. in ab. The *vavákṣa* would be accented in either reading – either as a subordinated verb or one first in its pāda.

Note the distant etymological figure: *vakṣáthaḥ* (a), *vavákṣa* (d).

X.115.2: The vs. has a number of teasing word plays, initiated by the sequence *nā́ma dhāyi*, which appears to contain the idiom *nā́ma √dhā* 'give a name' (*nāma-dhā́-* 1x, *nāma-dhéya-* 1x), but in fact the two words should be separately construed.

In context *dán* can hardly be anything but an endingless loc. to *dám-* 'house': as Ge (n. 2a) points out, 'establish the ritual fire in the house' is a widespread locution. The question is how we arrive at this form. A gen. sg. *dán* to this stem is widely accepted (e.g., AiG III.243–44, EWA s.v. *dám-*), but this is from a preform **dám-s*, with the nasal assimilating to the dental ending. It is possible that in ambiguous passages (like I.120.6) gen. *dán* was misinterpreted as a loc. of the endingless type (e.g., *udán* 'in the water') and spread to unambiguous loc. contexts. (In fact JPB tr. as a loc. there, though I would substitute the gen. "you two house-masters of beauty," flg. Ge.) That *dán* here is on the model of gen. *dán* elsewhere is essentially Old's view – though he also considers the possibility that it's really a gen. here. I'm not sure how that would work contextually. And he also floats the possibility that *dán* is a redactional change for **dám*. Given the instr. *datā́* 'with his tooth' in b, one should factor in a word play with *dánt-* 'tooth' (so also Re). In any case the form is not directly comparable to the Old Aves. vṛddhied endingless loc. *dąm*. (I thank DG for very useful disc. on these passages.)

With root accent, *bhásman-* should be a noun, not an adj. (though it is universally assumed to be an adj.), and it can be so rendered: "with his tooth with its bite." On the other occurrence of the *bhásmanā* in the RV, see comm. ad V.19.5. On the stem see EWA s.v. This pāda is very similar to VII.4.2c.

On *abhipramúrā* see Scar 390–91.

X.115.2–3: The mid. part. *próthamāna-* in d is the only mid. form attested to this (not very well attested) root; it is followed immed. by the act. *próthantam* in the next vs. (3b), whose voice is confirmed by other occurrences of this stem. The middle form here also occupies metrical positions 4–7, making a caesura after 4 or 5 impossible. Given that the opening of 2d *inó ná* is somewhat echoed by 3b *índum* and that immed. following act. *próthantam* allows a caesura after 5, 3b seems to repair 2d, where the irregularities call attention to the form. I have no explan. for the contrastive voice of *próthamāna-*; I very much doubt that semantics is involved.

X.115.3: This vs. is couched entirely in the acc. and has no syntactic connection with either the preceding or the flg. vs. With Ge and Re I supply a harmless 1st ps. verb of calling/praising to govern both the acc.s and the *vaḥ*.

As Ge (n. 3ab) points out, the vs. is dense with imagery, and as I point out in the publ. intro., the words can do double or even triple duty: *dru-ṣád-* is appropriate for the frame (the fire sitting on the firewood) and for two associated similes (the latter unmarked as a simile): a bird sitting in a tree and the soma drop sitting in the wooden cup. (The applicability to the drop is not noted by Ge/Re, but is by Scar [566–67]; also more or less by Old.)

Agni is several times directly identified as *váhnir āsā́* "conveyor by mouth" (I.76.4, 129.5 [in opposite order], VI.11.2, 16.9=VII.16.9), not in a simile – so *ná* here seems at first pleonastic. However, I think it contributes to the density of imagery noted above: *váhniḥ* should be read twice, with Agni explicitly compared to a draught-horse.

virapśín- and its associated forms are not usually construed with the instr., but see IV.20.5, cited by Ge.

The hapax pres. part. *sarájantam* is anomalously formed (apparent disyllabic root syl *saráj*). It must be construed with *ádhvanaḥ* (prob. acc. pl., but possibly gen.-abl. sg.). The form has been ascribed to numerous different roots: √*sṛ*, √*sṛj*, √*raj*; for details consult KEWA s.v. (EWA simply refers to the earlier work). As far as I know, no one has tried *sráj-* 'garland' or *sará(g)h-* 'bee' (though I was sorely tempted by the latter: "buzzing along the ways"?). I see no grounds for decision, but I think it's possible that it's a portmanteau (/mash-up) of √*sṛ* 'flow, run' and √*sṛj* '(be) released', both of which appear with *ádhvanaḥ*: X.22.4 *sṛjānáḥ ... ádhvanaḥ* [acc.] and VIII.59.2 *sísratū rájasaḥ pāré ádhvanaḥ* [gen.]. Such a tricky form would be at home in this tricky hymns.

X.115.4: As disc. in the publ. intro., this and vs. 6 are the two most complex vss. in the hymn, and in each vs. I think the topic is Agni (sg.) and his flames (pl.). My interpr. differs in many details from Old, Ge, and Re, though it is closer to Old. In particular, with Old but contra Ge/Re, I take *ná* in b as simile-marking rather than negative (though unfortunately it precedes the simile proper). I will not otherwise register agreements and disagreements.

In my interpr. the trick in the first hemistich is that the two nom. pl. masc. forms *vā́tāḥ* and *ácyutāḥ*, which, cutely, iconically encircle the verb *pári sánti* 'encircle', are *not* to be construed together in an inherently self-contradictory phrase "immovable winds." Rather they belong to two different similes, the second unmarked (as in 3b). Thus Agni's flames are compared to two conceptually opposite natural elements, the ever-volatile winds and the never-moving mountains. For the encircling of winds, see IV.24.4 *párijman ... vā́tāḥ*. For *ácyuta-* with mountain / rock, see I52.2 *párvataḥ ... ácyutaḥ*, VI.17.5 *ádrim ... ácyutam*. In the latter passage, the rock <u>surrounds</u> (*pári ... sántam*) the cows (see also IV.1.15 and [with pl. *ádrayaḥ*] III.32.16).

On *jrayasāná-* and its type see comm. ad IV.3.6.

In the 2nd hemistich I take Trita as identical to Agni, though he could also (with Ge, etc.) be the one sent to search for Agni. See comm. ad X.46.6, 3.

X.115.5: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. has the feel of a final vs. – the first of several. It has some associations with vs. 7. The cadences of a and c are disturbed.

For the connection with the Kaṇvas, see Ge (n. 5a).

X.115.6: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. appears to belong with vs. 4, so that vs. 5, the pseudo-final vs., is an intrusion. As in vs. 4, I think this vs. concerns Agni and his flames. In vs. 4 the flames surround him and urge him on to battle; in this vs. they concede to his superior power. In vs. 4 they are in the pl., in this vs. the sg. That Agni is the referent of the dative phrase

that dominates all four pādas is clear, but Ge/Re identify the sg. nom. as the wind, against my 'flame'.

The hapax voc. *supitrya* is taken by most as 'good for the Pitars' – possible, but at least in my opinion the base adj. *pítrya-* generally means 'ancestral'. In any case, the voc. does not seem to have much connection with the rest of the vs. thematically.

In b the phrase *tṛṣú cyávānaḥ* reminds us of the cmpds *tṛṣu-cyávas-* (VI.66.10) and *tṛṣu-cyút-* (I.140.3). The latter qualifies Agni, but the former is used of Agni's tongues, i.e., his flames – and this is the exact usage I see here. Note that *cyávānaḥ* picks up *ácyutāḥ* in 4b.

There is no finite verb in this vs., but as Ge (n. 6b, fld. by Re) suggests, *ánu* in b invites a verb to be supplied; the best choice is *ánu* √*dā* 'concede', which regularly takes a dative.

The dat. phrase of ab is continued by ... *saté* in c and *mahíntamāya* ... *avíṣyate* in d. The syntax of c is otherwise problematic, however: the problem is the rel. prn. *yáḥ*, which interrupts the dative phrase as (if?) an embedded rel. cl., but what the rest of that rel. cl. might be is unclear. Re essentially ignores the *yáḥ*; Ge (n. 6cd) says that a verb needs to be supplied with *yáḥ*, similar to what was supplied in ab, but I don't quite see how he puts the pāda together and in particular what he does with dat. *saté*. I now think that the phrase consists of *yó* + adverbial instr. *dhṛṣatā́* and that it is a nominal izafe, embedded in the dative phrase. As argued in my 2022 Fs. Hale paper, nominal rel. clauses (i.e., izafe-like structures) can be embedded in the RV, contrary to be-verbed rel. clauses. Our cl. would mean, literally, "who [is] with daring." It is very similar to VIII.21.2 *ugráś cakrāma* <u>*yó dhṛṣát*</u> with the adverbial neut. NA *dhṛṣát* to the same stem. I now think that supplying a verb ("acts") in the publ. tr. was wrong, and I would emend the tr. to "to him in his daring when ..."

As for the rest of the pāda, with Gr I construe *anudré cíd* with *saté* despite their distance. Note that *anudré* echoes *ánu* in b, and the *d* might even hint at the √*dā* to be supplied in b. Moreover *anudré cíd* corresponds to *dhánvanéd* "even through a wasteland" in d (so also Ge n. 6cd), both indicating the unpromising locations in which fire seeks its food.

Now as for *váram* – in adverbial usage, this form is usually construed with *ā́*, and in fact this is easily extracted from immed. preceding *dhṛṣatā́* (i.e., as *dhṛṣatā́–ā́*). But I don't quite understand what "by choice / acdg. to wish" adds semantically to this pāda.

Pace Gr, *dhánvanā* must belong to 'wasteland', not 'bow'.

X.115.7–9: As indicated in the publ. tr., each of the last three vss. of the hymn presents itself as a final summary vs., each in a different meter. Vs. 7 is the last Jagatī vs. of this otherwise Jagatī hymn and may have been the original final vs.; vs. 8 is in Triṣṭubh, 8 Śakvarī. These last two vss. explicitly name the poet – or at least provide a name for the Anukramaṇī to affix to the hymn: Upastuta (8b), the sons of Vṛṣṭihavya, the Upastutas (9ab).

X.115.7: This vs. seems to pick up vs. 5, with its mention of *sūrí*-s (5c, 7a). These patrons (in the instr.) receive praise along with Agni, while the instr. in b (*nṛ́bhiḥ*) must, in my view, refer to the poet/singers (contra Ge, who thinks they're still the patrons). The plural subjects of cd are unidentified, but I think they are likely the patrons again.

In b *sáhasaḥ sūnáraḥ* "the spirited (son) of strength" obviously plays on *sáhasaḥ sūnú-* 'son of strength', defeating expectations in the second syllable of the second word. Note also that *(sū)náro* plays on immed. following *nṛ́bhiḥ*. I don't think we're dealing with haplology (per Ge n. 7b) but with deliberate misdirection. As Re points out *sūnára-* and its relatives are never elsewhere used of Agni.

Pāda d is almost identical to IV.16.19, as Ge (n. 7d) points out.

X.115.8: This vs. responds in a way to vs. 2, where Agni's name was at issue (*agnír ha nā́ma*). Here he is explicitly given another name or epithet: "child of nourishment" (voc. *ū́rjo napāt*). This name can also be seen as a substitute for the name "son of strength" gestured to, but avoided, in the preceding vs., 7b – and note that *sahasāvan* in this address picks up the *sáhasaḥ* in the name in 7b. Unfortunately this connection cannot be seen in the publ. tr., because I translate *sáhasaḥ* and *sahasāvan* differently. I would now alter the publ. tr. in 8a to 'possessing strength' from 'mighty one'.

X.115.9: Pāda c *tā́ṃś ca pāhí gṛṇatáś ca sūrī́n* is a reprise of 5c *agníḥ pātu gṛṇató agníh sūrī́n*, which may account both for the metrical lapse (10-syl. pāda for 11) and the flipped placement of the 2nd *ca* (on which see JSK DGRV I.135). As for the meter, Old suggests distracting *tā́n*, but the parallel in 5c speaks against this: the 4-syllable openings match (*agníḥ pātu* and *tā́ṃś ca pāhí*), and what follows the caesura should match too – but *ca* does not match the syllable count of *agníḥ*.

X.116 Indra

For the structure of paired vss. see publ. intro.

X.116.1–2: Each of the four pādas of vs. 1 begins *píbă*; non-initial unaccented *piba* in 2a provides continuity.

X.116.3: As in vs. 1, each pāda of this vs. begins with a repeated impv., *mamáttu*. In the bcd pādas everything after that impv. is in a rel. cl. whose antecedent is the unexpressed subj. of *mamáttu*. To bring out the parallelism, b might be better tr. "let that exhilarate (you) which is pressed among earth-dwellers." In any case the "you" of b should be parenthetical.

X.116.4: On *aminá-*, see (somewhat unhelpful) comm. on VI.19.1.

This is the only really challenging vs. in the hymn, the challenge lying in the second hemistich, esp. d, and what to do with *khédām*. Scar (683) takes it as a unit of measure, used adverbially, on no clear grounds. Ge (and implicitly Old) take it as obj. to *ā́ vṛṣasva*, but this doesn't work either syntactically or semantically. The lexeme *ā́ √vṛṣ* takes gen. objects almost exclusively (the only exception is III.60.5 *sutáṃ sómam ā́ vṛṣasva*). Moreover, the obj. of the lexeme is always soma. This pattern is found in the 1st vs. of the hymn, 1b *píbā mádhvas tṛpád indrā́ vṛṣasva* and matched in our vs. by *sutásya ... mádhvaḥ ... ā́ vṛṣasva*. As for the semantics: *khédā-* in its two other appearances (VIII.72.8, 77.3) is a concrete object capable of being threefold or triply turned (*trivṛ́t-* VIII.72.8); I take it as 'hammer' in VIII.77.3, where it is used to fix spokes into a wheelrim. On both counts it seems best to detach *khedā́m* from the verb *ā́ vṛṣasva*, which should be construed with the long gen. phrase that occupies all of pāda c.

What then to do with *khedā́m*? I start with the observation that forms of √*khid* (verbal and nominal) are regularly found in conjunction with √*han* forms (IV.25.7 *khidáti hánti*, VIII.77.3 *sám ...vṛtrahā́khidat, khé ... khédayā*, VI.22.4 *khidvaḥ ... asuraghnáḥ*). Here it immed. precedes *aruśahā*. I suggest taking it as a detached 1st cmpd member, assuming **khedā-hán-* "smashing the hammer," parallel to *aruśa-hán-* -- or else as an external argument to *aruśa-hán-* "smashing the hammer on the *aruśa-*."

As for *aruśa-*, Old and Scar (683–84) take it as a PN, but the interpr. of Gr and Ge (seemingly accepted by EWA s.v. *rúśant-*) as a negation of *rúśant-* 'shining, white' is appealing, given Indra's penchant for slaying dark beings. Scar, who discusses the proposal at length, is understandably concerned about the formation. We might expect *ruśat-* as 1st cmpd member (as in *rúśad-vatsa-*) -- though this would produce a difficult-to-parse **ruśad-dhán-*. But I think it likely that *aruśa-hán-* was produced and perceived as a near-anagram of *asura-hán-* (RV 3x).

X.116.5: On *ní* reversing the fundamental meaning of the verb *bhrāśáya-*, see Ge (n. 5ab) and my *áya*-Formations (p. 86).

The hapax *vigadá-* is most likely derived from the much-later-attested root √*gad* 'speak'. See comm. ad X.97.2 on *agadá-*. Although Ge tr. "im Streit," in his n. 5d he specifies this as "Wortstreit"; cf. Old's tentative "unter verwirrten Reden (der Feinde)."

X.116.6: This vs. takes the verbal lexemes used in vs. 5 with concrete objects and applies them to abstract qualities and to an animate being (Indra). In 5b *áva* √*tan* 'loosen' was used of bowstrings; in 6ab *ví* √*tan* takes as object 'fame' (pl. *śrávāṃsi*, so lit. 'fames, reports of fame' – unfortunately not an English idiom), 'might' (*ójaḥ*), and 'hostilities' (*abhímātīḥ*) – with the bowstrings kept, but in a simile. The switch from *áva* to *ví* is potentially problematic, because *ví* √*tan* ordinarily means 'stretch out, stretch through', not 'loosen', so it should have essentially positive value here and mean the opposite of *áva* √*tan*. This is argued at length by Old, similarly by Th (Fremd. 72–73). Although I see their point, the attempt to impose a positive value on the verbal lexeme requires Th to produce a highly unnatural interpr. of the hemistich. I think in just this passage we must reckon with the essential equivalence of *áva* √*tan* and *ví* √*tan*, in line with Ge's interpr. This is not hard to motivate: *ví* has a number of different senses: 'apart, widely', 'through', and – crucial here -- 'without' (generally in nominal forms, admittedly). The negating value of this last usage can be transferred to this nonce verbal form.

In 5a *ní* √*bhṛś* was used of arrow points made blunt; in 6d Indra himself is 'unblunted' (*ánibhṛṣṭaḥ*).

X.116.7: The past participles in c, *sutáḥ ... pakváḥ*, are in a chiastic relationship with the impvs. in d: *addhí ... píba*. That is, Indra is urged to eat what is cooked and drink what is pressed.

The impvs. in d, *addhí ... píba ca*, are both accented; *addhí* owes its accent to its pāda-initial position, *píba* owes its perhaps to the fact that it's explicitly conjoined with *addhí* but more likely because it's perceived as opening a new clause, even though *prásthitasya* must be construed with both verbs, as 8a *addhí ... prásthitemā̃ havī́ṃṣi* shows.

The final phrase, *píba ... prásthitasya*, picks up the same in 2a, forming a weak ring.

X.116.8: Pāda b provides yet another pairing of food and drinking (see 7cd), here with concrete nominals, *pacatā̃ ... sómam*.

X.116.9: This final vs. opens out first to Agni in addition to Indra (in a dual dvandva) and then to the gods in general. As indicated in the publ. intro., the final image of the gods as dice whirling around, giving and withholding luck, is a surprising one. On *udbhíd-* see comm. ad VIII.79.1.

X.117 Generosity

On the unusual nature of this hymn in a RVic context, see publ. intro. Although the hymn is made up of bromides, it makes some artful use of word order.

X.117.1: I would now prefer to tr. *vadhá-* here and in vs. 6 as 'bane' or 'deadly bane'.

As Ge (n. 1b) points out, the AV reckons the "forms of death" to be 100.

X.117.2: This vs. alternates nominatives referring to the miserly rich man and datives referring to his hungry (ex-)friend, as if to intertwine them even as the subj. refuses the importuning beggar.

The hapax *raphitá-* has no obvious etymology (see EWA s.v. *rápas-*) or meaning, though it obviously refers to some sort of miserable state. I have interpr. it as semantically adjacent to *rápas-* 'defect, malady', rather than √*rap* 'jammern' (per Th., Ged. 78), though neither of these works phonologically.

X.117.3: On *gṛhú-* see EWA s.v.

I take *yā́ma-* in the cmpd *yā́ma-hūti-* to √*yā* 'beg', rather than with the usual *yā́ma(n)-* 'journey'; see comm. ad X.64.1.

X.117.4: The play on the root √*sac* in ab can hardly go unnoticed: *sákhā ... sákhye, sacābhúve sácamānāya*. The isolation of nom. *sákhā* (the stingy non-companion) from the rest of the √*sac* forms and the distance between the verb *dádāti* and its (partitive) obj. *pitváḥ* seem to be iconic for the separation between the non-companion and his would-be companion and between a potential act of charity and the actual gift. This separation contrasts with the intertwining of the same two figures in vs. 2.

In d *anyám* should, by my rules, be definite since it is non-initial, but I can see no way to interpret it as anything but indefinite "another"; the āmreḍita *anyám-anyam* in the next vs. (5d) is properly positioned for an indefinite. For another anomalous positioning of *anyá-* (though in the opposite direction) see nearby X.119.7. This syntactic rule may be eroding in the late RV.

X.117.5: I'm not sure what to do with *íd* – it's perhaps displaced, and the pāda should be interpr. "it's just the stronger man who should give ..."

I take the phrase in b to be the equivalent of English "take the long view."

X.117.6: As noted ad vs. 1, I'd now change the tr. of *vádha-* to 'bane' or 'deadly bane' for fluency.

X.117.7: In later Skt., forms of *apa* √*vṛj*, lit. 'twist away', mean 'complete, finish'. This appears to develop from an idiom specialized for weaving. See AVŚ X.7.42 *nā́pa vṛñjāte ná gamāto ántam* concerning two weavers: "They wrest not off; they go not to an end" (Wh). The the first verb, *ápa vṛñjāte*, must express the somewhat delicate manoeuvre (see YouTube videos on this procedure) of removing the woof (=vertical) threads from the loom when the cloth is finished. I use the less specific English idiom "wrap up," which also signifies closure. I'm not sure what idiom English uses for the removal from the loom (if there is one), but the equivalent in knitting is to "bind off."

X.117.8: The solution of this numerical riddle provided by Ge (n. 8) seems quite convincing and bears some resemblance to the Greek riddle of the sphinx, as Don points out. It is somewhat

curious that herd animals come in groups of five (*paṅktī́ḥ*), but see Old and Ge (n. 8d). The use of *paṅktí-* here is surely in part because 'five' is the next number in the series of riddles, but the fivefold classification of *paśu*-s found across Vedic prose is probably also at issue. On this classification see B. Sojkova, Animals in Vedic Prose (DPhil. diss., Oxford Univ., 2022). The larger question is what is the riddle meant to be conveying here: it doesn't seem entirely on message. Presumably that having more feet doesn't make you better off, but instead worse. If there's relevance to this hymn it may be that giving away what you have (and thereby having less) will be a good move for you.

X.117.9: The examples given in this vs. seem even less relevant to the generosity theme than vs. 8, since they are concerned with the differential performance of two apparently identical items. Pāda d forces the topic back to "giving" but not very convincingly. It almost seems as if, in vss. 8–9, the poet went off on a riddle track, started by vs. 7, and lost sight of his main theme. I suppose the whole vs. could be interpr. as counseling generosity to the less fortunate because of the inherent inequality in the world – but this seems somewhat counter to the standard Vedic worldview.

On the non-**o*-grade in kinship terms as 2nd compound members (apropos *sammātárā* here), see J. Lundquist, "Does *tvátpitāraḥ* = εὐπάτωρ?" *IEL* 9 (2021), esp. 133–36.

X.118 Agni Rakṣohan

This hymn is banal in the extreme; its salient feature is the inter-verse chaining.

X.118.1: As noted in the publ. intro., despite the Anukramaṇī ascription, "demon-smiting" Agni is barely visible in this hymn, though the first pāda of this initial vs. does establish such a theme.

X.118.1–2: There is no explicit chaining between these two vss., but *út* opening 2a may respond contrastively to *ní* in 1a.

X.118.2–3: *(sᵘv)āhutaḥ* (2a): *(sá) ā́hutaḥ* 3a.

X.118.4: This vs. consists of almost nothing but links to preceding vss. In pāda a *ajyate* responds to the same form in 3c; both are construed with an instr., though with slightly different functions: *srucā́* in 3c identifying the instrument performing the anointing and *ghṛténa* the substance. The latter also picks up *ghṛtā́ni* in 2b. In b *(mádhu-)pratīka(ḥ)* echoes *prátīkam* in 3c, and *ā́hutaḥ* the same forms in 2a and 3a. In c *rócamānaḥ* matches *ví rocate* in 3a; the preverb *ví* there is teasingly replicated in the sequence *rócamāno vi(bhā́vasuḥ*), though the *ví* in 4c is not construed with the preceding participle.

X.118.5: After the frenzy of linkage in vs. 4, this one marks a new start: the only link is the preverb *sám*, with *sám idhyase* (a) echoing *sám ajyate* (4a).

The pāda *devébhyo havyavāhana* occurs in this form 3x (III.9.6, X.150.1, as well as here) and once as the minimally different *devébhyo havyavā́hanaḥ* in the next hymn, X.119.13. The formula presupposes that nominative, rather than the voc. found here and in the other two occurrences, since *devébhyaḥ* must belong to the phrase and an initially accented **dévebhyaḥ* would be expected in a voc. phrase (even though *devébhyaḥ* is of course not a voc. itself).

X.118.6: Despite the transmitted *martā(ḥ)*, it seems best, with Old, to restore **mart^{i}yā(ḥ)*, both for the meter and for the chaining with *márt^{i}yāḥ* in 5c.

X.118.7: *ádābh^{i}ya-* is the link between 6 and 7. This is also the first vs. since 1 with a *rakṣohan* theme, and it also has echoes of that vs.: the voc. *ágne*, *śocíṣā* picking up *śuci(-vrata)* (1c), *dīdihi* picking up *dī́d^{i}yat* (1b).

X.118.8: The immediate link between 7 and 8 is *dī́d^{i}yat* (c) with *dīdihi* (7c), but this of course also matches *dī́d^{i}yat* in 1b. Another link to vs. 1 is *(uru-)kṣáyeṣu* with *(s^{u}vé) kṣáye* (1c), and note also *prátīkena* (a) echoing *prátīkam* (3c) and *(mádhu-)pratīka* (4b).

Ge and Re (see also Mayr., PN s.v.) take *urukṣáya-* (also in 9a) as the PN of a poet or his family, which seems unnec. to me. Although the Anukramaṇī ascribes this hymn to one Urukṣaya, this can have been plucked from the hymn, as elsewhere, esp. in X. In I.2.9 the stem modifies Mitra and Varuṇa and means 'having wide dwelling', and the *ti*-stem abstract *urukṣití-* also means simply 'wide dwelling' (VII.100.4, IX.84.1). The fact that *urukṣáya-* here seems to respond to *kṣáya-* in 1c seems to me an argument against a PN.

X.118.9: On *urukṣáya-* see ad vs. 8.

The first two pādas are made entirely of recycled materials: *táṃ tvā* (also 5c), *gīrbhíḥ* (*girā́* 3b), *urukṣáyāḥ* (*urukṣáyeṣu* 8c), *havyavā́ham* (*havyavāhana* 5b), *sám īdhire* (*sám idhyase* 5a). The last pāda breaks new, if similarly hackneyed, ground.

X.119 Labasūkta

A number of pairs of vss. pattern together: 2–3 share a pāda (2b=3a); 4–5 concern the *matí-*; 6–7 have the identical phrase *#nahí me ... caná* and both concern the insignificance to the poet in his current state of major components of the world; 9–10 both have *pṛthivī́m* as obj. and share the phrase *ihá vehá vā* at the end of the b pāda.

X.119.1: The opening of the hymn, with *íti vā́ íti*, is unusual, to say the least. The repeated *íti* cannot be taken as a standard use of the quotative particle – nor can the *íti* that marks the end of the refrain. The various tr. render it as "such" or "thus," which to my mind dampens the rhetorical exuberance of the 1st-person assertions. (A particularly stilted version is Maurer's "My inclination is thus.") I therefore render it as a strong affirmation, flg. Thompson 2003 (*EJVS* 9).

X.119.2: The standard tr. (Ge, Re, Mau) supply "trees" as obj. in the simile in pāda a, either modified by an acc. pl. *dódhataḥ* (Ge, Mau) or not, interpr. *dódhataḥ* as nom. pl. Like Don and Thompson I consider the added trees unnec.

X.119.2–3: I now think that *pītā́(ḥ)* should be tr. more literally; I'd substitute "(the soma-drinks) when drunk" in both vss. (2b, 3a).

X.119.4: The use of *putrá-* for a calf, a bovine "son," seems a bit unusual to me, but I have not checked all the RVic exx. of this stem.

X.119.5: The chariot-fashioning imagery applied to a "thought" (*matí-*) is a strong indication that the speaker is the poet, since this is a common trope.

X.119.6–7: I take both these vss. as implicitly subordinated (by *nahí*) to vs. 8. Having established the insignificance of the principal features of the cosmos in comparison to himself, the speaker asserts his complete dominance in 8.

X.119.6: The point here seems to be that the poet in his soaring flight looks down on the earth and the whole Ārya population is visually reduced to a tiny speck.

X.119.7: In the companion vs. to 6, the two world halves are reduced to the size of just one wing of the speaker (poet=bird). The predicate of this vs. is *práti* '(be) the counterpart (to)'.

Pāda-initial *anyám* should be indefinite, but it is difficult to make the expression mean "not equal to *another* wing of mine." The phrase "the one wing ... the other (wing)" is found in 11ab, where the two definite forms of *anyá-* are correctly positioned in non-initial position. For another wrongly positioned form of *anyá-* in the vicinity, see X.117.4 and comm. thereon.

X.119.10: On the hapax *oṣám* see EWA s.v., where it is plausibly derived from √*uṣ* 'burn'. I have rendered it slangily as "to blazes."

X.119.11: The *anyá- pakṣá-* phrase picks up 7b.

X.119.12: As Re points out, *mahāmahá-* is otherwise used of Indra.

X.119.13: For my take on this final, disconcerting vs., which has complicated (and I think skewed) other interpr. of the hymn as a whole, see publ. intro. As I say there, vs. 12 seems to me the climax of the hymn with Indra's assertion of supreme power. Vs. 13 I take as Agni's rather weak counter-assertion; the vs. certainly should not impose Agni as the speaker of the entire hymn, contra Re, etc.

Pāda b is identical to 5b in the immed. preceding hymn (X.118.5), except that it's in the nom., not the voc.

X.120 Indra

This is mostly AVŚ V.2, AVP VI.1, which latter is treated at length in Griffiths's (2009) edition of AVP VI and VII, pp. 3–18, which is well worth consulting. Griffiths (henceforth AG) also draws attention to the comm. on vss. 1–3 in JBr II.144, cited in his disc. (pp. 3–4). On my interpr. of the knotty problem of the identity of Bṛhaddiva, see publ. intro. Unlike AG, who follows Bergaigne in identifying him as Indra, I think he is actually Bṛhaspati, the alloform of Indra.

X.120.1: The identity of the neut. "foremost among beings/existences" (*bhúvaneṣu jyéṣṭham*) from which/whom Indra was born is unclear to me. Given this uncertainty, I would at least delete "living" from the tr. "living beings" – better: substitute "among beings / existing things." At this late stage of the RV we may be dealing with an undefined principle. AG tr. "the chief in the worlds."

On the ambiguous (and likely multiple) identities of the helpers (*ū́māḥ*), see publ. intro.

X.120.2: This vs. is a loose paraphrase of vs. 1, with ab corresponding roughly to 1bc and d to 1d; c lacks a parallel.

The preverb *ví* is found with √*an* only here in the RV, though it becomes quite common later, starting in the AV.

The neut. sg. *sásni* is problematic. Gr and Old (partially) want to emend to masc. nom. **sásnis*, and the following *s* (*sám*) might help (though for real degemination we should have a cluster -*s s*C-). Old also considers the transmitted form possible, but he wants to make it part of a neut. NP in c serving as another obj. to *dadhāti* in b: "Indra stellt Atmendes und Nichtatmendes als *sásni* hin," which seems an anacoluthon too far. It is probably better to take it as an "adverbial" or "infinitival" usage of this transitive redupl. stem. AG takes c as a nominal sentence, flg. the JBr interpr.: "Both the one which does not breathe, and the one which does breathe, is winning." This works syntactically, but what would its relevance be to this vs.?

As subj. in d, best to supply *ū́māḥ* from 1d, flg. Ge (n. 2d); that it recurs in 3b supports this suggestion.

X.120.3: On *ápi* √*vṛj* see comm. ad VI.36.2.

The point of b must be that the *ū́māḥ* subordinate their wills to Indra's, even though there are many more of helpers than of Indra. I do not understand Ge's n. 3b, where he contrasts the number of helpers with the number of gods. AG takes the numerical expressions in b quite differently.

I take cd as the direct speech of the helpers, addressed to Indra; the *íti* that opens the next vs. suggests this interpr., though Ge does not follow it.

Note the insistent alliteration in c *svādóḥ svā́dīyaḥ svādúnā sṛjā sám*, not to mention the etymological figure binding the first three words.

Ge's suggestion (n. 3d) that "yonder honey" (*adáḥ ... mádhu*) is the rain seems reasonable.

X.120.4: On *íti* see comm. on 3cd. The direct speech of the *víprāḥ* may continue in 4cd, merging with the speech of the poet of this hymn. For the presumed identity of that poet, see publ. intro.

Pāda b is a variant on 1d *ánu .... víśve mádanti ū́māḥ* : 4b ... *anumádanti víprāḥ*. This near repetition suggests that the *ū́māḥ* and the *víprāḥ* are the same, *pace* Ge, and also sketches a small ring.

X.120.5: On the meaning and etym. of √*śad* see EWA s.v. *ŚAD*[2] and Schaef., Intens. 30–32. The use of this verb of young women and their bodies (I.123.10, 124.6) favors the sense 'exult, flaunt' (so already Gr), against 'sich stark fühlen' favored by Th and Re and fld. by Kü and AG, on which see Kü 512–14 and n. 1032, AG (AVP VI+VII: 11), who also cites Pinault on this root.

X.120.6: The acc. phrase of ab characterizing Indra requires a verb to govern it; I supply "I praise," picking up the 1st ps. poet's discourse in 5cd. Alternatively – but this is a long shot – the hapax "Doppelstamm" gerundive *stuṣéy*[i]*yam* that opens the pāda may conceal a 1st ps. verb. This is a tempting possibility (though a similar suggestion by Roth is dismissively rejected by Old). Among other things the supposed gerundive begins *stuṣé-*, with its first two syllables coinciding with the well-attested 1st sg. -*sé* form *stuṣé* "I (shall) praise," which occurs 13x at the beginning of a pāda. I am now inclined to assume that that's what we started with here – but what about the

rest (*-y^{i}yam*)? Is it a separate acc. that has been mangled in some way, or, more likely (insofar as "likely" enters into it), has *stuṣé* been extended as a nonce 1st sg. optative? (This sugg. is similar to Roth's ill-fated idea.) Such a form would be tantalizingly similar, but unfortunately not similar enough, to the *dheyām* opt. type, over which so much ink has been spilled (also by me: see my 1999 Ged. Schindler article). Although I do not see a way to work out the details, I would now favor an alt. tr. "*I would praise the craftsman possessing many forms ..." AG (citing Kü 1996) assumes a haplology **stuṣé stuṣéyyam*.

X.120.7: The referent of *ávaraṃ páraṃ ca* is unclear, though it might be neut., given the *tád* (though that could be adverbial). Ge, flg. Sāy., supplies *dhánam* 'prize, stake, wealth' (Ge "Schatz"). This seems harmless enough, though nothing particularly favors it, save for *dhánā* in 4a. Moreover, *dhána-* is not usually simply 'treasure', but is rather a prize (vel sim.) to be won (as in fact in 4a). It *is* frequently construed with √*dhā*, as it would be here, but in the sense "set a prize," esp. in the common loc. absol. *dháne hité* "when a/the prize is set." If *dhána-* is the correct referent here (which I very much doubt), the clause should mean "you set (the prize), both the lower and the higher" – with no role for *ní* and no obvious contextual sense. AG (p. 14) suggests rather *rátnam*, in the same semantic sphere, which is also construed elsewhere with √*dhā*, but again there is no compelling reason to supply this word.

The oppositional pair *ávara- pára-* is fairly common, with a variety of meanings (see comm. ad X.55.4) and no fixed pair of referents. Probably the closest parallel to our passage is I.155.3 *dádhāti putró 'varam páram pitúr, nā́ma tr̥tī́yam ádhi rocané diváh* "The son sets in place the lower and the higher names of the father and the third name in the luminous realm of heaven," with "name" as the immediate referent, although the contextual referent is the three strides of Viṣṇu. But this is of no help here. If I were to speculate, I would suggest that Agni is the referent (and *tád* an adverbial red herring) because of the appearance of *ní* √*dhā*, a lexeme often used of the establishment of the ritual fire, and of *duroṇé*, which is almost always used of the house in which the ritual fire is kindled. If this is correct, the "nearer/lower" would be the ritual fire and the "further/higher" would be the sun. This would fit with the cosmic reference in c as well as Indra's (or Bṛhaddiva's) winning of the sun in 8b. However, it has nothing to do with either the Vala or the Vṛtra myth. I tentatively suggest an alt. tr. "Then you established the nearer (fire) and the further one, in the house ...," with no confidence in its correctness.

X.120.8: I take the praise of Indra as beginning in the middle of b, contra Ge and HPS (B+I 208). Among other things, *svarṣā́-* is never used of human, but does modify Indra in III.34.4 and his vajra in I.110.13. On the other hand, if (as I suggest in the publ. intro.) Bṛhaddiva is actually Bṛhaspati, or a proxy for him, *svarṣā́-* would be appropriate, since the adj. modifies him in VII.97.7. An alt. tr. would be "Bṛhaddiva, the first to win the sun, speaks these sacred formulations fortissimo to Indra: 'he has dominion ...' "

With HPS I take *svarā́j-* as referring to Indra, despite the slight awkwardness of the apparent double ref. to Indra in the clause (both subj. and gen.). Ge's identification of the sovereign king as Vala is unlikely on conceptual grounds; see HPS's remarks. AG (p. 16) takes Bṛhaddiva as subj. here, with Indra the referent of *svarā́j-*.

The referent of *svā́ḥ* 'own' is not clear – are these Indra's own doors or the own doors of the cowpen (*gotrá-*)? This pāda is identical to III.31.21, where it is harder to find any referent but Indra. The adj. may be applied proleptically: the cowpen is about to be his and so are the doors.

The prominent position of *svā́ḥ* as the final word of the vs. is probably the result of phonological play with the finals of b and c: *s^{u}varṣā́ḥ* and *svarā́jaḥ*.

X.120.9: On my assumption that Bṛhaddiva is really Bṛhaspati and is therefore addressing his alloform Indra, see the publ. intro. It is pretty much impossible to escape the interpr. that he is addressing "his own self (*svā́m tanvàm*), namely Indra (*índram evá*)." RVic discourse is seldom so straightforward. See, however, Ge's attempt to evade this interp. (n. 9b).

On the hapax *mātaríbhvarīḥ* (to a putative stem *mātaríbhvan-*), see Old ad loc. and AiG II.2.177 (neither v. satisfactory). If it does mean 'staying by their mother', this would correlate semantically with *ariprá-* 'flawless, stainless': both would refer to virginal girls (so Ge n. 9cd). The further referent is probably to hymns. As is regularly noted, *mātaríbhvan-* recalls *mātaríśvan-*, incl. the anomalous accent on *mātarí*. But Old is surely correct that the form should not be emended to a form of *mātariśvan-*. AG (in collab. with W. Knobl) suggests a novel interpr. of this hapax (pp. 17–18), which I am afraid I find farfetched: that it is a haplologized form of **mātari-ríbhvarīḥ* "singing on Mother (Earth)." Among other problems, as I have discussed at length (see reff. in Comm. lexicon), √*ribh* does not mean 'sing', but 'rasp, croak'; moreover, the meaning suggested seems reverse-engineered from the constructed pre-haplologized form and doesn't, to me, ring true.

X.121 Ka [SJ on JPB]

This hymn has been translated and discussed by a vast range of scholars (and non-scholars). I will not explore these various explorations.

Starting with vs. 2, the hymn exhibits the definitional riddling REL CL / answering MAIN CL structure found in hymns like II.12 ("who ..., he is Indra"), with, however, the further twist that the main cl. is a question.

X.121.1: Pāda b can be taken in a number of different ways: The past part. *jātáḥ* could mean, as often, "(just) born," "immediately after birth." The publ. tr. takes *āsīt* as an existential ("he alone existed"), but it can be (with most tr.) a copula: "he was the one lord ..." Since the subject is the lord of *bhūtásya* "what has come into being," the existential reading of the publ. tr. seems contradictory (if he alone existed, how can he be lord of what has come into being?) – though contradiction is often the point of such hymns. Still, the apparent paraphrase and expansion of this pāda in 3ab favors a rendering "he was the one lord / he alone was lord."

Most tr., contra the publ. tr., interpr. *dādhāra* as preterital ("he upheld ..."), but as Kü (261 and n. 390) points out, this pf. is ordinarily stative and presential, and that value is available here as well.

X.121.3: The first hemistich, indeed the first three pādas, of this vs. seem to expand on 1b. Corresponding to *pátir éka āsīt* there, we have *éka íd rā́jā ... babhūva* "he became the one king / he alone became king." The undefined and generic *bhūtásya* of 1b corresponds to *jágataḥ* "the moving world," which is further specified as "breathing, blinking" (*prāṇató nimiṣatáḥ*) (pāda a) and in c divided into "the two-footed and four-footed" (*dvipádaḥ cátuṣpadaḥ*). Once again, creation is a matter of division and subdivision.

Because of these structural echoes, I would not follow JPB's grouping of *ékaḥ* with *mahitvā́* ("just he alone by his greatness"), but tr. as I do immed. above.

X.121.4: Given the parallel positioning of *mahitvā́* in 3a and 4a, it surely is once again "his greatness," not in vs. 4 that of the mountains, as JPB takes it.

X.121.5: On the various interpretational possibilities for the ca in 5a, see JSK DGRV I.55 n. 20.

Pāda a is a transformational variant of 1c *sá dādhāra pṛthivī́ṃ dyā́m utémā́m* "he supports the earth and this heaven here," but in the passive: *yéna dyaúr ugrā́ pṛthivī́ ca dṛḷhā́* "by whom mighty heaven and earth are/were supported," both with the root √*dṛh* 'make firm, support'. The god's treatment of heaven and earth returns in the last real verse of the hymn (9) in an elaborated version; since vs. 5 is the middle verse, these expressions participate in an articulated structure -- first and last verses mediated by the middle -- that reminds us of omphalos structure.

X.121.6: I consider pāda c a circumstantial clause, equivalent to a loc. absol. – indeed an elaboration of the common loc. absol. *sū́ra údite* (approx. 10x; III.15.2 etc.), rather than referring to another set of beings (JPB's "(those) upon which"). I would substitute "when the risen sun shines widely." The moment when the sun rises marks the start of the day's battle, hence the nervous battle lines.

X.121.7: The hymn seems to be circling back on itself: 7c ... *sám avartatā́sur ékaḥ* # is a variant of 1ab ... *sám avartatā́gre, ... ékaḥ* ... Because of this echo, it might be tr. as "the one life-force ... evolved ..."

X.121.8: Two sets of echoes: the waters of pāda a recall those in 7a, with the b pāda exactly modeled on 7b: *gárbhaṃ dádhānā janáyantīr agním* (7b), *dákṣaṃ dádhānā janáyantīr yajñám* (8b). While c ... *devá éka āsīt* # is almost identical to 1b ... *pátir éka āsīt* #. I would substitute "he was the one god / he alone was god."

X.121.9: The first hemistich is a more dynamic version of 1c: in that pāda the subject just upholds heaven and earth (*sá dādhāra pṛthivī́ṃ dyā́m utémā́m*.), whereas here he engenders them. Moreover, this version also breaks up the conjoined NP H+E and shakes up the syntax with two different forms of √*jan*, all cast as rel. clauses: *janitā́ yáḥ pṛthivyā́ yó vā divám ... jajā́na* "he who is the progenitor of earth or who ... engendered heaven." The result seems like a ring-compositional expansion-cum-variation. However, the relationship between the expression in vs. 1 is maintained: the verb in 1c *dādhāra* is reprised here in the bahuvr. *satyá-dharmā* 'whose foundations are real'.

This is also the first, and only (save for the tacked-on vs. 10), place where the personal intrudes, with the wish that he not harm "us."

X.121.10: Rather cleverly, the *yát* embedded in the bahuvr. *yátkāma-* 'having what desire(s)' is extracted and appears as the independent *tát* in the main cl.

X.122 Agni

As indicated in the publ. intro., the hymn is attributed to a Vasiṣṭhid and ends with the Vaṣiṣṭha refrain (8d). The given name of the poet acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, Citramahas, has been extracted from the first pāda of the hymn, where Agni is called *citrámahas-* 'having brilliant might'.

The meter of the hymn vacillates between the dominant Jagatī and occasional Triṣṭubhs. Although acdg. to the Anukr. vss. 1 and 5 are Triṣṭubh, vs. 1 has only one unambig. Triṣṭubh pāda (a); c is clearly Jagatī and b and d end with -C*yam* sequences that are almost surely to be distracted: *advíṣeṇ^{i}yám* and *suvī́r^{i}yam*. As for 5, pāda a ends with another word that invites distraction, *váreṇ^{i}yaḥ*. The pāda then has only 11 syllables, but a Jagatī cadence. Pāda b is Triṣṭubh, but c and d are Jagatī. On the other hand, 3d is a clear Triṣṭubh (and 3b has a Triṣṭubh cadence but 12 syllables), and the Vasiṣṭha refrain (8d) is a Triṣṭubh pāda and limited to the Triṣṭubh hymns of VII. In this late hymn the fungibility of the two trimeter types is manifesting itself. For another such hymn, see X.114.

X.122.1: Note the caesura at the cmpd seam of a non-dvandva: *citrá-/mahasam*.

On *śurúdh-* see comm. ad IX.71.5.

X.122.2: Pāda d requires an object to be supplied; there are two candidates: *bráhma* (from c), so Ge, Re, and the publ. tr.; *vrátam* (from d), so Th (Unters. 21 and n. 1), HPS (Vrata 66). Both are paralleled: VII.22.9 *bráhmāṇi janáyanta* (cf. also VII.31.11); VII.75.3 *janáyanto daívyāni vrátāni*. Although I think either is possible, I am now somewhat inclined towards the Th/HPS suggestion, since I think it would be unusual for gods to create *bráhman-*; in the two passages just cited, the subjects are poets. I would therefore now suggest an alt. tr. "Following your commandment, the gods begot (their commandment(s))."

X.122.3: As Ge and Re point out, the "seven domains" are the domains of the sacrifice (cf. IX.102.2, IV.75, as well as nearby X.124.3 *ṛtásya dhā́ma ví mime purū́ṇi* with vs. 1 *yajñám ... saptátantum*.

Unlike Ge/Re but with Kü (354), I take dat. *sukṛ́te* with *māmahasva*, not as parallel to *dāśúṣe* with *dā́śat*. There are no implications, but it's attractive to supply *māmahasva* with a compliment. (For dat. with √*maṃh* see, e.g., VIII.1.32.)

Note *suvī́ra-* here, between *suvīr^{i}ya-* in 1d and 4d.

X.122.4: Ge (n. 4b) appositely adduces the seven Hotars in VIII.60.16, etc.; the "seven domains" of 3a is of course also relevant.

X.122.5: The referent of *amṛ́tāya* is unclear. Ge considers it a reference to "die Götterwelt"; Re tr. "pour le (principe) immortel." Because of the associated impv. *matsva* 'become exhilarated', I take it as a reference to soma (so also Gr), though I realize that Agni is not a standard drinker of soma.

I don't know what the Maruts are doing here, though see Ge (n. 5c).

In d *rurucuḥ* would be better read **rūrucuḥ*, as also in the almost identical IV.7.1. For this possibility see comm. ad IV.7.1, 16.4.

X.122.6: I interpr. *duhán* as taking a double acc. construction, "milk the cow (for) milk," with Ge (tr., though he considers alt. in n. 6a), contra Re, who thinks all the acc. refer to the milk substitute. The pāda-final adj. *viśvádhāyasam*, repeated from 1c, could in principle modify either the refreshment or the cow. I take it with the former, since in 1c it modifies "riches," a desirable product, not a producer.

Although Gr, Ge, and Re agree in interpr. the hapax *yajña-prī́-* as 'loving the sacrifice', transitive forms of √*prī* don't mean 'love' but 'please'. The rendering 'pleasing to the sacrifice' in the publ. tr. uses this sense, but I now think it should be refined. In the similar cmpd *brahma-prī́-* (2x) I take *prī́-* with this transitive sense, but the first member *brahma-* as instr. in function: "pleasing [X] with the formulation" (see comm. ad I.83.2). A parallel sense "pleasing [X] with the sacrifice" works well here, conforming to the other descriptions of the ritually active sacrificer in this hymn (3b *dāśúśe sukṛ́tāya*, 4b *yás ta ā́naṭ samídhā*, 4d *pṛṇaté*). I would now emend the tr. to "... for the sacrificer who pleases with the sacrifice" – the object of "please" presumably being the gods.

In b the voc. *sukrato* returns from 2b, and in d this nominal stem is made into a denom.: *sukratūyase*.

In c *ghṛtasnú-* recalls 2c *ghṛ́tanirṇik*.

The distribution of elements in cd is uncertain. Both Ge and Re (in his tr.) take *ṛtā́ni* as obj. of *dī́dyat* (e.g., Re "en éclairant trois fois les (domaines de) l'Ordre"). But as Re points out in his n., "*dī-* n'est factitif qu'avec des régimes internes" – or, better, √*dī*, esp. in the participle, is almost always in absolute usage: "shining," not "shining on X" or "making X shine." I therefore take this pāda-final participle in purely adjectival usage, interrupting the acc. phrase that continues in d. As Ge (n. 6cd) points out, *tríḥ* in c should be construed with *vartíḥ ... pariyán*, referring to the triple fire-circuit. I take *ṛtā́ni* as parallel to *yajñám*. This is essentially identical to Re's emended tr. in his n.: "toi qui, en brillant, parcours le circuit autour des *ṛ́tá*, (autour du) sacrifice," though he leaves out the *tríḥ* (probably by mistake).

pariyán returns from 3a.

X.122.7: The idiom *ní* √*mṛj* is rare and fairly idiosyncratic in its usage, usually meaning 'drag down, clasp to oneself' sometimes with loc. *tanvī* (hence my "(on your body)" here; see, e.g., comm. ad II.38.2, VII.26.3, X.39.14). Even without the preverb, √*mṛj* does not take as object the substance to be wiped (here *ā́jya-* 'melted butter') but the animal figure to be wiped upon. I wonder if *ā́jyam* is meant to evoke *átyam* 'steed', which is an occasional obj. of √*mṛj* (e.g., VII.3.5 *agním átyam ná marjayanta*). In any case the usage here seems at best a mixed construction, and it is possible that the *ní* simply anticipates the *ní* that opens the following vs. Both Ge and Re render this pāda rather vaguely.

X.123 Vena

On the difficulties of this hymn and its connections with other hymns, see publ. intro. As I say there, I consider the *vená-* 'seeker' to be both Soma and the Sun. The treatments of this hymn are too manifold and often too fanciful to engage with in detail. I will just set out my barebones interpr. Ge's notes are useful to consult and stay sensible.

X.123.1: Note that the first word of the hymn, *ayám*, situates the subject in the ritual here and now, which positioning is reinforced by *imám* beginning the 2nd hemistich. To bring out this rhetorical emphasis it might be better to recast the tr. as "This one do the inspired poets lick with their thoughts like an infant (calf), at the union of the waters and the sun."

Whatever the exact referents, this vs. depicts a conceptual birth, with the two RVic hapaxes *pṛ́śni-garbha-* (fem. pl., 'whose embryo is dappled/the dappled one') and *jyótirjarāyu-* (masc. nom. sg., 'whose afterbirth is light') (sim., for both, Ge nn. 1ab and 1b) as well as the licking of the infant in d, an action performed by a mother cow just after a calf is born (also Ge

n. 1d). The females in question can be both the waters, whose embryo is soma, and the dawns, whose embryo is the sun. The afterbirth of light could be, for Vena=soma, the spreading of the golden liquid across the filter; for Vena=sun the radiance after sunrise. Pāda d treats the importance of poets and their hymns in the production of both soma and sunrise.

X.123.2: On this vs., see comm. ad VIII.100.5, which is similar in phraseology. As disc. there, the Vena is regularly associated with heights (also in IX.85.9–12). Here the first three pādas seem to depict the first sighting of the soma emerging from the pressed plant on the top of the filter and the first sighting of the sun rising through the clouds.

Against Ge's attempt (n. 2b) to make *nabhojā́ḥ* modify *pṛṣṭhám*, it seems better to take the two as independent nom. sg.s. So, more or less, Scar (140), though he tries to accommodate Ge's views.

On *vrā́-*, see comm. ad VIII.2.6 and my treatment of this word in the 2003 HPS Fs. Here it probably refers to the hymns eagerly seeking the Seeker; thus, like 1d and 3d it keeps the theme of the importance of the praise hymns in the forefront.

X.123.3: This vs. recycles vocab.: *samānám* (a =2d); *ṛtásya sā́nāv ádhi* (c =2c); *rihánti* (d = *rihanti* 1d). In pāda a I supply *yónim* with *samānám* on the basis of the immediately preceding pāda, 2d *samānáṃ yónim* ; all standard treatments supply instead "child" (Ge: "Kind," Don) or "calf" (Gr, Lü 605). This is certainly possible, and the phrase *samānáṃ vatsám* is found elsewhere (I.146.3), but in the absence of any compelling reason to switch referents I weakly prefer my solution, esp. since *samānáṃ yónim* is also found in III.33.3 and X.17.11.

The part. *vāvaśānā́ḥ* in pāda a is most likely a pun, belonging to both √*vāś* 'bellow' and √*vaś* 'desire'.

With Ge (n. 3d) I take *mádhvo amṛ́tasya* as the gen. obj. of *rihánti*, though not very happily: I don't really think that 'lick' should take a partitive genitive. Gr (s.v. *rih*) seems to suggest that *vā́ṇīḥ* is the object, but identifies the same form as a nom. pl. s.v. 2.*vā́ṇī*. However this phrase is configured, it's a clear example of synaesthesia, since "voices" ordinarily do not lick, nor are they licked.

X.123.4: On the possible connection of this vs. with "name-and-form" see publ. intro. Note that it contains both *rūpám* (pāda a, almost the first word of the verse) and *nā́ma* (last word of the verse) in polarized position. Although the two appear to belong to different episodes, both the form and the name(s) are the product of similar processes of discovery and recognition. This combination, esp. with the further presence of *ṛténa* "with truth" opening the second hemistich, is almost sufficient to qualify the verse as an omphalos, or at least the centrally placed lesson of the hymn.

Ge connects b with a, while I connect it with c because there movement is depicted in both b and c.

X.123.5: The introduction of the Apsaras responds to the mention of the Gandharva in 4d. Beyond that I make no effort to interpr. this vs., though see Ge's nn. for more or less plausible possibilities.

Note the brief nominal clause ending the verse, *sá vénaḥ* "he is the Seeker," which presents itself as the solution to a riddle we didn't know was being posed.

X.123.5–6: Because I consider vs. 6 to be dependent on 5cd, I take the injunctives *cárat* (5c) and *sī́dat* (5d) as preterital, because of augmented *abhy ácakṣata* in 6b. Ge (and Don) keep vs. 6 independent – it's not clear to me how Ge deals with the subordination of 6: he tr. *yád* as "als" but the attachment to 7 is vague. If vs. 6 is independent, then presential "wanders" and "sits" would be appropriate for 5cd, but thematically 6 seems to fit better with 5, with the wing (5d, 6c) – though the presence of *nā́ke* in both 6a and 7b does give me pause.

X.123.8: On the downplayed "climax" in this vs., embodying name-and-form, see publ. intro.

This vs. forms a slight ring with vss. 1–2: *rájasi* (d): 1b *rájasaḥ* ; *vídharman* (b) recalls *vimā́ne* (1d); *samudrám* (a): *samudrā́t* (2a).

On the connection of *vídharman-* with *nā́ka-* (vss. 6–7), see comm. ad V.17.2.

Ge (fld. by Don) construes the instr. *śukréṇa śocíṣā* with the pf. part. *cakānáḥ* ("mit ihre hellen Glut begehrt"), but the Vena vs. IX.85.12 *bhānúḥ śukréṇa śocíṣā* without part. makes this unlikely. Kü (142 n. 132) is in agreement with me.

X.124 Various divinities

On this famous and much discussed hymn, see publ. intro. and, especially, my detailed treatment of it in my 2016 "The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas" (Ged. F. Staal: *On Meaning and Mantras: Essays in Honor of Frits Staal*, ed. George Thompson and Richard Payne, 289–306), which challenges the entrenched view of the hymn as depicting the conflict between the Devas and the Asuras so ubiquitous in Middle Vedic literature. I will not here repeat the arguments found in that article in detail, but make global reference to it.

The sec. lit. on this hymn is immense; I will just note two fairly recent treatments: Theodore Proferes (2007), *Vedic Ideals of Sovereignty and the Poetics of Power* (New Haven: American Oriental Society), 106–13, and Joel Brereton (2016), "Reconstructing Ṛgvedic Religion: *Deva*s, *Asura*s, and Rites of Kingship" in *Vedic Investigations* (Proceedings of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference, Helsinki, Finland, July 2003), ed. Asko Parpola and Petteri Koskikallio, 35–58 – neither of which I am in complete agreement with, though it is important to note that both scholars free themselves from the dominant Asura/Deva model. Again I will not engage with the multiple other interpr. of the hymn.

The hymn is couched in dialogue for the first 6 vss., though there is no agreement on who all the speakers are. 1st and 2nd person references abound. The last three vss. (7–9) are in the 3rd ps. and spoken, presumably, by the poet.

X.124.1: As Ge points out (n. 1b) there are a number of ways to "solve" the numerological references here. The exact referents matter less than the fact that Indra is offering Agni participation in an elaborate, already worked-out ritual system; he's not just improvising, even though, as I argue in the art. cit., we are watching the primal instantiation of the sacrifice.

The "long darkness" in which Agni has been trapped in d is, by my interpr., the pre-yajña stage in which the ritual fire was not kindled.

X.124.2: In my interpr. the being that Agni is leaving behind is Father Heaven (Dyauṣ Pitar). Although identifying him as a "non-god" (*ádeva-*) might seem paradoxical, I argue at length in the art. cit. that though Heaven is the *father* of the gods, he is not a god himself.

Both words in the phrase describing Agni's goal, "an alien lineage" (*áraṇīṃ nā́bhim*), need unpacking. With regard to *áraṇī-*, I argue in my 2016 art. that the word "seems generally to refer to 'foreign' or 'alien' places and people primarily in terms of physical distance and separation from familiar surroundings, not kinship or natural affinity." I also suggest that it participates in word play here: the differently accented *aráṇī-* is the word for the kindling sticks used to produce the ritual fire. As for *nā́bhi-*, lit. 'navel', it is used both for kinship affiliation and, more often, to refer to the ritual ground, indeed to the ritual fire itself, as the conceptual navel or center of the universe. So, under the ritual interpr. of those two words, Agni is going from a pre-sacrificial to a sacrificial state.

X.124.3: Against many interpr., I take the speaker of this vs. not as Agni (e.g., Ge, Re), but Varuṇa (so also Don, Proferes). The "guest of the other branch" (*anyásya átithiṃ vayā́yāḥ*) is Agni, whose journey (in vs. 2) Varuṇa has just witnessed. Recall that Agni is frequently called the guest (of men, etc.), since he is a god, whose original domain should have been heaven, installed in a mortal setting.

Varuṇa's claim to "measure out the many domains of truth" refers, in my view, to his measuring out the ritual ground for the instituting of the sacrifice. See the parallels adduced in the Staal Ged.

"Father Asura," again in my view, is Dyauṣ Pitar. See the art. cit. for instances where he is called an asura. "Father" is of course part of his title.

X.124.4: Again, rather than Agni, I think Soma is the speaker here (with Don, Proferes). His defection means that the crucial ritual materials – fire and soma – are now available for yajña. The assemblage of the four principal gods, Indra, Agni, Varuṇa, and Soma, signals that the conceptual revolution is complete.

The speaker's curious expression "I have 'done' many years within him" refers to Soma's confinement and inactivity, deprived of any ritual role.

X.124.5: On this vs. as expressing the twin kingship of Indra and Varuṇa with their complementary functions, see the art. cit.

Pāda b contains subordinating *ca*, as shown by the accent on *kāmáyāse*.

X.124.6: I argue in the art. cit. that the first hemistich depicts the passing of the old heaven/sun-centered religion to one based in the midspace, closer to the mortal world.

"Come forth" (*niréhi*) in c, addressed to Soma, implicitly responds to Soma's statement about doing many years "within" the father (4a), while pāda d expresses his desired transformation into a ritual substance, an oblation. On the purport of this pāda see disc. in art. cit.

X.124.7–9: These three final vss. contrast sharply with the first six, esp. in leaving dialogue behind in favor of strict 3rd person. For my view that these vss. effect the transition from the closed loop of gods sacrificing to themselves to the divine–human partnership that prevails now, see art. cit. As I argue there, vss. 7–9 are delimited by a ring, and it is through the shifting referents of that ring that the movement from divine to human sacrificers comes about, what I call there "an indirect transfer of sacrificial responsibility." Vs. 7 begins *kavíh kavitvā́* "the poet with his poetic craft"; the referent is Indra. Vs. 9 (and the hymn) ends *kaváyo manīṣā́* "the poets with their inspired thought"; the poets are human, with Indra (acc. *índram*) their object. Both

phrases have a form of *kaví-* and an instr. of near-synonymous words for poetic production: the "with" phrase has been relexicalized; the *kaví-* forms are in different numbers. Moreover, though the 'poet' word is the same, the poet referred to in the first phrase is a god; the poets in the second are humans. The lexical identity masks this transfer of sacrificial responsibility. In such subtle ways do RVic poets subvert even perfect ring-compositional matches.

To sum up these verses I say in the art. cit.

> Without calling attention to it, the composer of X.124 has modulated from the gods-worshiping-gods model, with Indra as a kavi, to one in which other, presumably human, kavis offer praise and sacrifice *to* the god(s). The closed circle is broken and the human/divine dynamic established, but the verbal identification of Indra and the human kavis implies that the current model of sacrifice derives from the older one depicted earlier in the hymn and that the human officiants are occupying formerly divine roles.

X.124.7: Although there is a sharp stylistic break between vss. 6 and 7 and although, as I just argued, vss. 7–9 form a unit, there is, nonetheless, conceptual continuity between 6 and 7. In 6c Indra and Soma prepare to smite Vṛtra; throughout the RV it is the killing of Vṛtra that allows the waters to flow, starting in 7b.

The poet-agent (*kavíḥ*) in pāda a is not identified, though the agent of pāda b is: Varuṇa. It would be possible to take Varuṇa as the referent in pāda a as well. In fact, though Indra is sometimes called a *kaví-* (e.g., I.11.4, VI.32.3), Varuṇa is a more poet-like figure than Indra. See, e.g., from a hymn dedicated to Varuṇa, VIII.41.5 *sá kavíḥ kā́vyā purú, rūpáṃ dyaúr iva puṣyati* "he is a poet who fosters the many poetic arts, as heaven does its (concrete) form [=sun]," which also contains the *rūpá-* in heaven found here. Nonetheless I think Ge (n. 7a) and Re are correct that Indra is the subject. He is the focus of these three vss., and, moreover, it is the peaceful royal partnership that Indra invited Varuṇa to join (see vs. 5) that is celebrated in the rest of the hymn.

Placing the sun in heaven is one of Indra's standard cosmogonic actions (e.g., I.7.3 *ā́ sū́ryaṃ rohayad diví* "he made the sun mount in heaven," etc. etc.); I therefore take *rūpám* here as a reference to the sun (so also Re: "la forme (solaire)"), rather than "his [=Indra's?] form" (Don, Proferes) or "die Farbe" (Ge). See VIII.41.5 cited immed. above, where *rūpám* also appears to be a ref. to the sun. To reflect this mythological time I would change the tr. from "has fastened" to "fastened."

The releasing of the waters in b is also prototypically Indra's deed – here presumably credited to Varuṇa because of the power-sharing arrangements of the two gods, aided by Varuṇa's growing association with water.

Note the phonological and morphological similarity of the two parallel, pāda-final verbs: *sajat* and *sṛjat*.

As I point out in the Staal art., co-wives are notoriously *un*peaceful towards each other (see RV X.145, 159); the peace achieved here is thus esp. noteworthy – or else the pāda slyly hints that the rivers are not all that peaceful. This pāda is variously interpr. – see, e.g., Re's over-elaborate "Les rivières ... ont fait (d'elles-mêmes) une possession-pacifique (à l'usage d'Indra)" – but my interpr. seems to conform best to the Skt. phrase.

I do not know what "bear his color" refers to. First, what is the referent of *asya*? Ge (n. 7d) opts for Varuṇa, but his parallels are not strong – though the echo *váruṇo* (b) / *várṇam* (d) is

suggestive. Indra seems more likely, esp. since he is surely the referent of *asya* in 8a. But I am uncertain about what exactly his *várṇa-* is. I am toying with the possibility that it is the physical manifestation of Indra's impurity, the blood guilt, incurred by slaying Vṛtra: Indra distributes the impurity arising from killing to various natural elements in Vedic prose accounts (e.g., TS II.5.1). Since waters are well known as removers of impurity (see, e.g., I.23.22), this could make sense.

X.124.8: The phrase *svadháyā mádantīḥ* is also used of waters in VII.47.3. In both cases I think the *svadhā́-* belongs to the waters, even though in this case the previous pāda states that they follow Indra's power. But in the next pāda they exert their *svadhā́-* by choosing him as king.

The depiction in c of the choosing of a king by the clans (*víśaḥ*) is striking and has been much discussed (e.g., Proferes 94, 110–11, Ober. Relig. I.352, Jamison art. cit.).

X.124.9: I forebear from speculating myself on the mystical image of the roving goose, but see Proferes's discussion (110–13, 127–28) of the goose as royal symbol and symbol of the sun, associated with unction waters.

Since the pf. of √*ci* is presential (see comm. ad X.114.9), I would emend the tr. here to "do the poets discern."

X.125 Speech

On this famous hymn and the carelessness its fame has induced in its many translators, see publ. intro. Re (HymSpéc) points out that the word *vā́c-* does not occur in the hymn, which is, therefore, an extended riddle. I am not at all certain that I would have solved it, but we don't need to: Vāc is identified by the Anukramaṇī as both the poet and the dedicand of the hymn. The hymn also belongs to the genre of *ātmastuti* "self-praise," with forms of *ahám* extremely prominent, esp. at the beginning: the first 7 pādas all begin with *ahám*, with an extra one in 1d.

X.125.1–2: The speaker's association with divinities progresses from groups of undifferentiated gods (1ab), to dual divinities (1cd), to single gods (2ab).

The pres. *bibharmi* (1c, 2a) is a good candidate for a habitual reading of the redupl. pres.

X.125.1: In all clear cases (uncertain: VI.51.7, VII.25.11), the cmpd *viśvádeva-* is a bahuvrīhi meaning 'possessing / belonging to all the gods / the All Gods', as its accent indicates. In this passage it is universally interpr. (incl. in the publ. tr.) as a nominal designation 'All Gods / all the gods'. However, it could in fact be a bahuvrīhi and modify the three previous instr.: "with the Rs, Vs, and Ās, comprising all the gods." In favor of this interpr. is the fact that the Rudras, Vasus, and Ādityas are sometimes mentioned together, implicitly as the totality of the divinities (see, e.g., nearby X.128.9 and Macd., Vedic Myth., 130). However, the position of *utá* speaks against this interpr. — which, however, I consider a strong alternative.

The three paired entities in cd are progressively less differentiated: the dual dvandva *mitrā́váruṇā* has two accents and two inflectional endings and is split across the caesura; the dual dvandva *indrāgnī́* has a single accent, a single inflectional ending, is not read distracted (as it sometimes is), and precedes the caesura (though it occupies the same metrical slot as *mitrā́váruṇā*, immediately after pāda-initial *ahám*); *aśvínā* is not a compound of two divine names but refers to a pair without individual names.

X.125.2: The Anukr. identifies this vs. as Jagatī, but the first pāda is a Triṣṭubh.

On the difficult word *āhanás-* see comm. ad V.42.13.

Bhaga is universally taken as a separate god here, though it would be possible to take *bhágam* as an epithet of *pūṣánam*, "Pūṣan the distributor," an interpr. weakly favored by the position of *utá* (though JSK [DGRV I.340] considers this an X *uta* Y Z construction).

After the divinities in the first verse and a half, we arrive at the human ritualist in cd.

X.125.3: It is only in this vs. that the gender – feminine – of the 1st ps. speaker is established – by a flood of fem. nouns and adjectives in ab and d, *rā́ṣṭrī saṃgámanī ... cikitúṣī prathamā́ ... bhū́riṣṭhātrām ... āveśáyantīm*, and by the demonstrative *tā́m* reinforcing the (genderless) 1st ps. enclitic prn. *mā*. The gender is of course an important clue for the solution of the riddle, esp. since female divinities are scarce. The content of this vs. also provides a few clues to further narrow the already narrow field of female divinities. The fem. agent noun *rā́ṣṭrī* 'ruler' (a) is found once elsewhere (VIII.100.10), where it clearly refers to Vāc. (On the single form of anomalous masc. *rā́ṣṭrī* see comm. ad VI.4.5.) In c the statement that the gods distributed her in many places would remind any Vedic hearer of the divisions of speech that are a staple topic of Vedic enigmas (see, e.g., my Hyenas, 251–60).

The two characterizations of Vāc in d *bhū́riṣṭhātrām* and *bhū́ry āveśáyantīm* are clearly meant to complement each other. The morphology of the second term is also very clear, namely a transitive-causative participle to *ā́ √viś* 'enter', which should have the sense 'cause to enter'; cf. I.176.2 *tásminn ā́ veśaya gíraḥ* "cause the hymns to enter into him." The poet must have meant the causative morphology to be taken seriously, because in the corresponding vs. 6 (forming the ring around the omphalos vss. 4–5) we encounter the non-causative pf. *ā́ viveśa* (6d). Despite all this clear signaling, translators have tended to ignore the morphology and make the phrase mean what they think it ought to: e.g., Re "j'entre en beaucoup (de formes)" (HymSpéc, but see EVP XVI.166, where he is more sensitive to the morphology); Don "I ... enter into many forms"; Mau "entering upon many a form"; Ge slightly better "viele (Formen) annehme" (though this still doesn't accurately represent the morphology). If we take the morphology seriously – and I think we must – the phrase has to mean "causing many things to enter (me)." This provides a striking contrast to *bhū́riṣṭhātrām* "having many stations." On the one hand, she has been infinitely subdivided and is found in many different places, but on the other she encompasses everything – the multiplicity of things enters into the single entity that is Speech, which can express them all. As often, if we hold ourselves to taking the grammar literally, it leads to a more interesting result than just going by what we think it ought to mean: by the standard interpr. *bhū́ry āveśáyantīm* is simply a paraphrase of *bhū́riṣṭhātrām*, but taking the causative seriously produces a sharp contrast and sketches a totalizing project.

X.125.4–5: On these vss. as the omphalos, see publ. intro. Note, inter alia, the repetition of *vadāmi* (4d, 5a). To bring out the relationship, the two verbs should have been translated identically. I would now change the first to "I say to you."

X.125.4: On the interpr. of this vs., see publ. intro. The first hemistich provides another clue to the identity of the speaker, but once again it is oblique. She asserts her power over a bodily function – but, surprisingly, it is not speaking, but rather eating. This at first appears to be a nonsensical statement: how does Speech enable eating? The connection is the location: the mouth is the locus of both speaking and eating, and so, by a bit of slippery logic, Speech claims

control over eating. She also makes another assertion, which is subtly conveyed by the syntactic structure: the primacy of eating over any other sensory activity – seeing, hearing, breathing. These last three are conveyed in relative clauses ("who sees ...," etc.), which are dependent on the main cl "he eats." Since food is essential to life, sensory activity is dependent on eating. (The hierarchy between eating and the other senses is elided by tr. like Don's "the one who eats food, who truly sees ... (etc.)," which ignore the *sá ... yáḥ* structure.) See the publ. intro. for a second possible message, directly relevant to the poet, in this same passage.

The final pāda of the vs. is justly famous for its phonological and etymological patterns: *śrudhí śruta śraddhiváṃ te vadāmi*. Watkins (Dragon 111) argues that it contains "an exhaustive classification of the speech sounds of the Vedic language, with one example of each class: the vowels *a, i, u* and a single icon each of the oppositions of quantity (*a* : *ā*) and nasalization (*a* : *aṃ*); a single sibilant *ś*; a single liquid *r*; a single semi-vowel (glide) *v*; a single nasal *m*; and a single order of stops, *t d dh* as tokens of the oppositions of voicing (*t* : *d*) and aspiration or murmur (*d* : *dh*)."

The pāda is also at almost the exact center of the hymn, where the "message" is often located. It contains the only imperative in the hymn, which must be addressed to the poet, and the only 2nd ps. prn. (*te*). Once again, the familiarity of the pāda has led to some lack of focus in tr. The tendency has been to take *śruta* in its common usage as 'famed, famous'; see Ge "Höre, du Berühmter"; Watkins (Dragon 111) "Listen, o famous one." Even further afield, Re (HSpéc) "Écoute, toi qui sais," which is either a major extension of 'hear' to 'know' or a lapse on his part. The trick to (what I think is) the correct interpr. is to take *śruta* as 'heard' ➔ 'listened to', not 'heard of' ➔ 'famous'. Speech is addressing the poet as the conduit of her message; others listen to him, and he can therefore convey what she says to a wider audience as long as he himself listens to her.

X.125.5: The first hemistich seems to echo the content of *bhū́ry āveśáyantīm* in 3c in other terms. Although she acts on her own (*ahám evá svayám* "just I myself ..."), what she says is applicable to and favorably received by both the divine and the human realms – that is, to all beings.

The anomalously accented old past participle to √*juṣ* 'enjoy', *júṣṭa-*, ordinarily takes a dat. complement (presumably conditioned by its accent retraction). This is the only place in the RV where it is found with the instr. expected with a ppl. It is probably no accident that this involves the phrase "by gods and men" (*devébhir utá mā́nuṣebhiḥ*); cf. the three instantiations in Old Avestan of the similar phrase *daēuuaišcā* (...) *maṣiiāišcā* (Y. 29.4, 34.5, 48.1), though with the Avestan semantic shift of *daēuua-* to the negative side.

The second hemistich concerns the choosing and creating of a poet by Speech. It is reminiscent of Vasiṣṭha's happy memory of the day when the god Varuṇa made him a poet: VII.88.4 *ṛṣíṃ cakāra svápā máhobhiḥ*, *stotā́raṃ vípraḥ* ..." He [=Varuṇa], himself skillful in his work, made him [=Vasiṣṭha] a seer through his great powers. / The inspired one [=Varuṇa] (made him [=Vasiṣṭha]) a praise singer."

X.125.6: I do not know why this vs. is so aggressive in tone. Perhaps the mention of the "formulator" (*brahmán-*) in 5d brings to mind the enemy of the formulation (*brahma-dvíṣ-*) and reminds Speech that true speech must always be defended.

dyā́vā-pṛthivī́ brings us back to the dual dvandvas of 1cd; like *mitrā-váruṇā* there the dvandva here is split by the caesura and also has all the furbelows of a true dual dvandva: double accent and double inflectional ending.

Re (HSpéc.) suggests that *samádam* is a verbal contest (p. 253 n. 11 "la joute oratoire"), an idea taken up by both Don and Mau. This is not impossible, esp. given the identity of the speaker (Speech). However, it is far from necessary: well-attested *samád-* isn't otherwise specialized for verbal contests, and Speech can be implicated in regular battles ("fighting words"). On *samád-* see Scar 381–83.

The pf. *ā́ viveśa* contrasts with *āveśáyantīm* in 3c, as discussed there. In vs. 3 many things enter her; here she herself enters.

Her entering Heaven and Earth here picks up the gods and men of 5b: both phrases are merisms of a sort, referring to the totality of beings / realms by their two most conspicuous and contrastive members. She will further develop this in the next vs.

X.125.7: This vs. expresses Speech's total pervasion of Heaven and Earth, announced in 6d. It does so by using two deep-structure formulas, with gapped members – a demonstration of her own virtuosity. I do not think this vs. has been understood correctly by previous interpr. We start with the apparent paradox, "I give birth to the father on his head." In my view, the father (*pitár-*) is Father Heaven, Dyauṣ Pitar (of whom we heard so much in the immed. preceding hymn, X.124). The paradox of his place of birth, "on his [own] head" (*aháṃ suve pitáram asya mūrdhán*), can be resolved by reference to a different formulaic phrase, "the head of Heaven" (*mūrdhán- diváḥ*): this phrase is regularly used of Agni (e.g., I.59.2, III.2.14, VI.7.1, VIII.44.16 -- cf. also X.8.6 *diví mūrdhā́nam dadhiṣe* also of Agni). To expand this: "I give birth to Father Heaven on the head of Heaven (i.e., Agni)." In other words, we are dealing with two formulae: *dyaúṣ pitā́* and *mūrdhán- diváh*. They intersect in this pāda, and in both formulae one of the words in the formula is gapped – but the *same* word, namely "Heaven." What this means is that by being present and officiating on the ritual ground, beside the ritual fire, Speech creates and sustains the cosmos – from the restricted space on earth to the very top of heaven. From this space she spreads through all realms and across all beings and touches heaven.

The phrasing here may contain a buried pun. The unaccented *suve* is of course the 1st sg. mid. root pres. to √*sū* 'give birth' and is necessary to the clause. However, it resembles the reflexive pronominal adj. *s^{u}vá-* 'own' (regularly distracted), and if accented **suvé*, could be a loc. modifying *mūrdhán* "on his own head."

As sometimes elsewhere (see comm. ad I.57.5, VIII.40.4), 'heaven' is modified by a fem., in this case the pronominal adj. *amū́m* 'yonder', which may seem esp. disturbing because (at least in my interpr.) Heaven is the father in pāda a. But this can be interpr. as part of Speech's totalizing project: she has contact with both aspects of a putatively androgynous Heaven. (At least *amū́m* has the right deixis; sometimes the fem. demonstr. with heaven is *iyám* 'this here'; see comm. cit.)

varṣmán- (and apparently synonymous *várṣman-*) is regularly construed with *diváḥ* (VI.47.4, X.63.4), so, *pace* Re (HSpéc), Don, and Mau, Speech does not touch heaven with *her varṣmán-*.

X.125.8: In the final vs. Speech claims a larger territory than even heaven and earth – in c she asserts that she goes beyond them both. She also manifests as the wind, which is of course suitable for speech, which is carried by breath.

Strictly speaking, *enā́* cannot modify *pṛthivyā́*, despite the standard tr., because *pṛthivī́-* is fem., and instr. *enā́* in masc.-neut. Unlike 'heaven' (see ad 7d above), 'earth' does not switch genders. Hence my "this earth here" is misleading, but I can't come up with a suitable adverbial rendering.

X.126 All Gods

On the elementary structure of this hymn and on its meter, see publ. intro.

X.126.1: As often, a pattern in a hymn takes a while to settle down: although in vss. 2–7 pāda b is occupied entirely by the same trio of gods in the same order, Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman (in nom., except voc. 2b), in this initial vs. the three are scattered across cd.

X.126.2: The lexeme *níḥ √pā* is found only here and seems to have been confected in order to find some way to repeat *áṃhas-* from 1a.

X.126.3: The construction *té ... (a)yám*, with pl. nom. *té* seemingly doubled by sg. nom. *ayám*, in pāda a gives Old fits and he spins increasingly complex scenarios to explain it. Re (EVP XVI.167) claims that *'yám* was borrowed from 1c, which seems quite dubious to me. I think that, given the individual listing of gods in b, it's conveying that each one is both separately and jointly here.

On the dependence of splv. *párṣiṣṭha-* on *parṣáṇi* see Re ad loc.

X.126.5: A verb needs to be supplied in ab; "lead" seems the obvious choice, given its prominence in the rest of the hymn (1c, 2d, 3c, 4d, 6a) (so also Ge).

A surprising intrusion of other divinities in cd.

X.126.7: Ge and Re take *śunám* as adverbial or (Re) "semi-interjectif." I don't see why it can't be another object to *yachantu* in c. The word order in this vs. is tortured enough.

X.126.8: This vs. is identical to IV.12.8 in an Agni hymn. Why it has been added here, in a metrically variant hymn that contains only one glancing mention of Agni (5d), is unclear to me. Perhaps because of the *áṃhas-* in c, recalling the occurrences in 1a and 2c. Bloomfield makes no comment (and in fact doesn't register the repetition ad IV.12.8). The alternative poet's name given by the Anukr., Aṃhomuc Vāmadevya, bases the first name on *muñcata vy àṃhaḥ* in 8c and the patronymic on the original site of this vs. in the Vāmadeva maṇḍala. The full name is found only here in the Anukr., though there are several other poets with the Vāmadevya patronymic in X.

X.127 Night

X.127.1–3: Nom. *devī́* appears in the same place in all three vss.: in pāda b in the 4th and 5th syllables. My attempt to render this parallelism was impossibly stilted, so I abandoned it.

X.127.1: Night's "eyes" are presumably the stars. For stars see also vs. 7.

The position of *ádhi* is somewhat unusual for a preveb in tmesis.

X.127.2: The actions ascribed to Night here are otherwise associated with Dawn and the sun. See, for ab, e.g., IV.52.5 *óṣā aprā urú jráyaḥ* "Dawn has filled the broad expanse," and for c X.37.4 *yéna sūrya jyótiṣā bā́dhase támaḥ* "by which, o Sūrya, you repel the darkness with (your) light." With *urú* I supply *antárikṣam*, since this phrase is extremely common. See, e.g., nearby X.124.6 *urv àntárikṣam*. However, *jráyaḥ*, as in IV.52.5 just quoted, would also do.

X.127.3: The part. *āyatī́* returns from 1a.

The root aor. *askṛta* is the only root aor. form with *s*-mobile in the RV. (There are a few forms to the pres. stem; the *s*- is more at home in the ppl.) In fact the Pp. reads *akṛta*, which, however, would produce a bad cadence. The preservation (if that's what it is) of *s*-mobile here must have been fostered by real or imagined degemination of the idiom *niṣ-(s)kṛ*; ; cf. I.92.1 *niṣkṛṇvānā́* — though of course here the preverb is in tmesis and the augment would have intervened in any case.

X.127.4: The initial *sā́* must be coreferential with the 2nd ps. relative expression *yásyāḥ ... te*. As I demonstrated in my 1992 "Vedic 'sá figé': An Inherited Sentence Connective," 2nd ps. reference for nom. forms of the *sá* / *tám* pronoun is only found in impv. clauses, and so I supply an impv. in the *sā́ no adyá* main clause – a form of (*ā́*) √*bhū* or (*ā́*) √*as* (with the *ā́* possibly concealed in *sā́*). As Ge (n. 4ab) points out, the same pāda opening *sā́ no adyá* is found in the Dawn hymn, V.79.3; there it occurs with an overt 2nd ps. impv. *vy ùchā*. I am not alone in supplying an impv here: it goes back to Sāy., though he takes the reference as 3rd ps. (*prasīdatu*), and as far as I can see simply ignores the *te*. Ge's imperatival "(Steh) du" more accurately captures the usage of 2nd ps. *sā́*. Re supplies a pres. indic. ("tu es"); other tr. -- Macdonell (VRS), Don, Mau – also recognize the 2nd ps. ref. but supply a past-tense verb (e.g., Macd. "So to us to-day thou [hast approached]") – though in *Hymns from the Rigveda* Macd tr. "So, goddess, come to-day to us," with an impv. but an invented voc.

X.127.5: This passage provides good evidence for W. Rau's contention that *grā́ma*- means 'roving band, horde' in the RV, not 'village'; though see comm. ad X.27.19 for a more nuanced assessment.

The parallel forms *padvánt*- and *pakṣín*- 'footed' and 'winged' respectively are a good argument against the view that there's a consistent functional difference between the -*vant*- and -*in*- possessive suffixes.

There is a range of possible tr. for *arthín*- lit. 'having a goal', e.g., 'busy' (as in the publ. tr.; cf. Ge's "geschäftigen"), but I think 'hungry' (Macd. *Hymns*), 'greedy' (Macd., VRS; Mau) go too far. However, a rendering more focused on the goal might be better; AR suggests "intent (on their prey)."

The meter of this vs. is especially slow, with the first half of each pāda containing mostly heavy syllables. This may represent the "settling down" of the entities in question.

X.27.6: The transmitted Saṃhitā contrast between the two pāda-initial impvs. *yāváyā* (a) and *yaváya* (b) is surprising. (The Pp. reads them both with short root syllable, *yaváya*.) As was established in my -*áya*- monograph (174–75), both stems are almost equally well attested in the RV, but their distributions don't overlap except in X: *yāváya*- is well established in the Family Books, from which *yaváya*- is missing. The short-vowel form is clearly a replacement for the

long-vowel stem. For further on the distribution see the disc. just cited. Why the poet chose to use both here in identical metrical and syntactic situations I have no idea.

X.127.7: The act. intens. part. *pépiśat*, the only intens. form to this root in the RV (though see comm. ad V.57.6), appears to be intrans., despite its diathesis. C. Melchert has pointed out, however, that there are no transitive neuter participles in the RV (save, possibly, for *várdhat* V.62.5, q.v.). On this intens. and its problematic intransitivity, see Schaeffer (152–53); after the RV the stem appears as middle *pépiśāna-*, whose middle form better fits its usage. The ornaments in question are clearly stars; cf. I.68.10 *pipéśa nā́kaṃ stṛ́bhiḥ* and VI.49.3 *stṛ́bhiḥ anyā́* [=night] *pipiśé*.

The simile in c is curiously hybrid. Although as Ge (n. 7c) points out, *ṛṇám* √*yat* is a later expression for 'settle a debt', in the RV the idiom is *ṛṇa-yā́-* (on which see the thorough disc. of Scar. 407–9). This √*yā* does not have any verbal forms (see tentative disc. in EWA s.v. the bracketed *YĀ*[3]); if it did, we should expect **yāpaya* here. The poet seems to be frustrating expectations with the odd, but phonologically similar expression *ṛṇā́* √*yat*, which may also have been encouraged by *yāváya ... yaváya* in the previous vs. The obj. in the frame must be darkness, with the point being that Dawn on her arrival should put it down or aside.

X.127.8: The poet is once again playing games with us. The voc. in the previous vs. was *úṣaḥ* 'o Dawn', and the first voc. in this vs. *duhitar divaḥ* (b) "o Daughter of Heaven" is regularly addressed to Dawn (or to Sūryā). But it is immed. followed (c) with the voc. *rā́tri* 'o Night'. Are both females present in this vs. or are we to assume that Night is also the daughter of heaven (as she rightly should be)? Note also that the middle impv. *vṛṇīṣva* 'choose' is the svayaṃvara verb, esp. appropriate to Sūryā (see my 2001 Fs. Parpola "The Rigvedic svayaṃvara? Formulaic evidence").

On the complex simile and the verb therein see Ge (n. 8b). The full expression, as he points out, is "make [=drive] cows homeward." Cf. X.169.*4 śivā́ḥ satī́r úpa no goṣṭhám ā́kaḥ* "(Prajāpati) has sent (the cows) here, being well-disposed, to our stable." This simile participates in the uneasy ambiguity between Night and Dawn just noted. In real-life terms cows are driven home at the beginning of the night, not (as apparently here) at its end with the advent of dawn.

Perhaps the most obvious problem with the simile is that it seems to have no object in the frame, but two in the simile: *gā́ iva* (a) and *stómaṃ ná* (c). Moreover, *stómam* is exactly the object we would want in the frame (hence my supplied parenthetical "hymn"). The various tr. attempt to have it both ways, understandably. I now think that the simile marker *ná* is displaced, and the simile in c consists only of *jigyúṣe* **ná*. As disc. elsewhere (see comm. ad VIII.76.1, X.21.1, and esp. my 2024 ECIEC paper "Penultimate *ná* in the RV: A Syntactic Archaism?" to appear in a forthcoming Fs.), simile-marking *ná* cannot appear pāda-final and appears flipped with its target under those circumstances. I would now therefore emend the tr. to "Like cows (to their pen) I have driven a praise song up to you, as if to a victor." Unfortunately pāda b has to be parenthetically inserted, which makes the parsing all the harder.

Note a minimal but telling sign of ring composition: nom. *rā́trī* opens the hymn and the voc. *rā́tri* opens its final pāda. The word is otherwise absent from the hymn.

X.128 All Gods

On the theme of competing sacrifices, see publ. intro. The hymn is also (more or less) AVŚ V.3 and AVP V.4 (ed. and tr. Lubotsky).

X.128.1–4: These first vss. are dominated by (usually) fronted 1st sg. pronouns: *máma* (1a), *máhyam* (1c), *máma* (2a), *máma* (2c,), *máhyam* (3d), *máyi* (3a, 3b [2x]), *máhyam* (4a), *máma* (4a), *me* (4b). But these pronouns abruptly cease at this point – though one might consider the regular repetition of *mā́* 'don't' (4c, 5c [2x], 5d, 8d [2x]) a continuation by other means.

X.128.1: In addition to the forms of the 1st sg. pronoun, note 1st pl. *vayám* (1b) and 2nd sg. *tvā* (2b) and *tváyā* (1d).

In b I take acc. *tanvàm* as referring to both the subject ("we") and the obj. of the part. *índhānāḥ* ("you" = Agni). Forms of √*puṣ* 'thrive' regularly take the acc. Scholarly opinion is divided on the referent – Agni: Ge; us: Proferes (*Sovereignty,* 44), Wh (AVŚ), Lub (AVP); Re (EVP XVI) sits on the fence. I see no reason why it can't be both. In favor of "us" are 3d, 5c.

X.128.2: Note *devā́ḥ ... sárve* versus *víśve devā́saḥ* in 4d, 5b.

The hapax *urú-loka-* must be a bahuvrīhi, as it is standardly taken – even though bahuvrīhis with *urú-* often have 2nd member accent (e.g., *uru-cakrá-*). There are, however, exceptions – e.g., *urú-yuga-*. The corresponding nominal expression is the truncated *u lóka-*. It's also worth noting that the noun this cmpd modifies and that it immediately follows is *antárikṣam*, which is regularly modified by *urú*, as was noted above ad X.127.2 – usually, but not invariably, in the order *urv àntárikṣam* (I.91.22, etc.; but III.22.2, IV.52.7 *antárikṣam urú*).

The publ. tr. does not render *asmín*; it could be modified to "for me, at this (my) desire," but it hardly seems worth it.

X.128.3: On the wording of the first hemistich, see comm. ad X.81.1.

Ge renders *vanuṣanta* as a modal, "sollen Partei nehmen." On the one hand, the modals that surround this form – impvs. *ā́ yajantām* (a), *astu* (b), opt *syāma* (d) – might support a modal reading. On the other, *pū́rve* 'ancient, previous, earlier' suggests that the divine Hotars in question performed an action in the past that can serve as a model. Since the verb stem *vanuṣ(a)-* is only attested here (though cf. *vanuṣyá-*), the morphology is not clear: is it an injunctive or a subjunctive? The AV versions (AVŚ V.3.5, AVP V.4.5) substitute *saniṣan*, an *-iṣ*-aor. subj., but this substitution for the morphologically isolated RVic form is of little evidential value for the interpr. of the RVic form, since the AV often replaces forms it clearly finds puzzling.

X.128.4: The construction of pāda a is unclear. Ge simply takes the two parts *máhyaṃ yajantu* and *máma yā́ni havyā́* as separate parallel clauses: "Für mich sollen sie opfern, mein sind alle Opferspenden," ignoring the rel. prn. Wh (AVŚ V.3.4, which has *yā́nīṣṭā́* [i.e., *yā́ni iṣṭā́*]) ingeniously takes the nom. rel. as subj. of *yajantu*: "Let what sacrifices I make make sacrifice for me," but I doubt that either *iṣṭá-* or *havyá-* can be subj. of act. √*yaj*; I certainly know of no such passages. (Lub's tr. of AVP V.4.4 seems to follow Wh's, though it is not unambig.: "For me let them sacrifice, whichever sacrifices are mine.") Like Wh and Lub, I want to take account of the rel. prn., but I also think the construction should follow a more conventional model. When the means of sacrifice, the oblation, is construed with √*yaj*, it is in the instr.; cf., e.g., V.3.8 *tvā́m ... ayajanta havyaíḥ* "They sacrificed to you [Agni] with oblations." I therefore assume a gapped instr. in the first part of the pāda, which is coreferential with the nominal izafe-like expression that follows.

X.128.5: On *dévīḥ ṣaḷ urvī́ḥ* see comm. ad X.14.16. I now see that the standard view, found already in Gr (def. 14 s.v. *urú*), that this is a ref. to the three heavens and the three earths (or some other sixfold division of the cosmos) is most likely correct – or at least provides a plausible solution. Why fem.? perhaps as a pluralization of sg. *urvī* modifying *bhū́mi- / pṛthivī́-* 'earth' or of du. *urvī́* modifying *ródasī* 'two world-halves' (common) or *dyā́vā-pṛthivī́*. I would now alter the tr. to "you six divine broad (world-spaces)," however awkward the English.

On the passive value of the *s*-aor. injunc. *hāsmahi* see Narten, Sig. Aor. 285.

X.128.6: On *nigút-* see comm. ad IX.97.53.

On *neśat* see comm. ad IV.1.17.

X.128.8: Old, flg. Ludwig, suggests that *uruvyácā(ḥ)* can be a neut. modifying *śárma*, but there seems no need to take it as anything but the masc. nom. sg. it appears to be. This adj. regularly modifies Indra (e.g., VII.31.11).

X.128.9: A touch of ring composition: *adhirājám* (d) recalls *ádhyakṣa-* in 1d.

X.129 Creation [SJ on JPB]

Given the brilliant analysis of this hymn by JPB in "Edifying Puzzlement: Ṛgveda 10.129 and the Uses of Enigma," *JAOS* 119 [1999]: 248–60, my comments will be minimal.

X.129.1: On the (metrically) lengthened nom. sg. *vyòmā* to the neut. *-man*-stem *vyòman-* see Lanman *Noun Infl.* 530–31 and AiG III.272. This is not unprecedented for neut. *-(m)an*-stems. Its neut. gender is (re-)asserted by the following izafe-type rel. *paró yát*.

X.129.2: Note the modulation from dominant *āsīt* to *ā́nīt* in c (and the final pāda introduces a diff. form of √*as*, namely pf. *ā́sa*). Also, although *ā́nīt* is not negated, its initial (*ā́n-*) evokes privative negation, and what follows, *avātám*, keeps the negation going.

X.129.3: The *ā(ḥ)* of b is of course the original 3rd sg. impf. to √*as*. As I say elsewhere (see comm. ad X.85.6–12), I consider this form (in its 5 occurrences in the late Xth Maṇḍala) as a pseudo-archaism. That is, it must have existed in pre-RV, but its occurrences in the RV are not precious archaisms but poetic party tricks. In this hymn the fact that we've already had 7 occurrences of *āsīt* (with more to come) and one of pf. *āsa* makes *ā(s)* here seem very studied, and the Jagatī line in the midst of Triṣṭubhs may be meant to call attention to this, since the form occurs in the cadence just before the inserted light syllable of a Jagatī cadence.

In c the second word in the sequence *tuchyénābhú* is ambiguous. Most interpr., incl. the publ. tr. and Re (EVP XVII), assume *ābhú-*[1] 'coming into being', which is supported by *ābabhū́va* in 6d, 7a. But Renou (Hymns spéc, ad loc. + n. 7) goes for 'empty', as does Gr (s.v. *ābhú-*[2], also with long vowel). This stem, *ābhú-* 'nullity', found in X.27.1, 4, clearly has this negative sense there and also clearly has a long *ā-*. The long *ā* of the negative form must be modelled on that of *ā́sat-* 'unreal' (laryngeal lengthening) beside *ásat-* 'nonexistent'. Here I think we're first supposed to interpr. it as 'non-being, void' (parallel to 1a), but then substitute the dynamic positive sense 'coming into being'. In other words, the first reading would be "a nullity that existed, concealed by emptiness," which would be modified to the publ. tr.

X.129.4: Most tr. construe *mánasaḥ* with *rétaḥ* (e.g., Doniger "that was the first seed of mind"). One of the great advances in interpr. of this hymn made by JPB is to challenge this standard view and to take *mánasaḥ* as an ablative with *ádhi*, with the construction spanning the pāda boundary. It is also the exact center of the hymn (the omphalos), and it is the first break in the conceptual stasis of the hymn, where heretofore syntactic units and metrical units coincide. The breaking of this stasis leads to a burst of creation and it also marks *mánas-* as the key word of the hymn and the source of all that follows.

Although this interpr. makes the *yád* clause dependent on *kā́maḥ*, which is in a different gender, gender attraction to *rétaḥ* would have been automatic.

X.129.5: The stretching of the cord, dividing below from above (and evoking the *bándhu-* of vs. 4), seems another instance of the Vedic view of creation as a process of division and differentiation. So far we've had single unarticulated masses – the signless ocean, the "one" – or entities defined by themselves (darkness hidden by darkness). Now we're dividing into twos, which inevitably means sexual division, which is of course productive. Already anticipated by *kā́ma-* and *rétas-* in vs. 4. The location of the crosswise cord seems to be roughly the human waist.

This is further developed in the 2nd hemistich, explicitly with *retodhā́ḥ* 'placers of semen' and implicitly with *mahimā́naḥ* lit. 'greatnesses', which in context can be pregnancies (so publ. intro.). The last pāda in this vs. is harder to interpr.: *svadhā́ avástāt práyatiḥ parástāt*, "There was independent will below, offering above" in the publ. tr. This pair, esp. the second term, does not fit easily into the conceptual dev. of the hymn, which has so far been tightly controlled. Certainly *práyati-* elsewhere in the RV refers to a ritual offering or "presentation," as does the lexeme *prá √yam*. But despite the RV's fixation on ritual elsewhere, this hymn otherwise pays no attention to the sacrifice. Perhaps pāda d is a paraphrase of pāda c: *svadhā́-* here refers to (male) sexual impulsion and *práyati-* the result – the "presentation" "holding forth" of pregnancy.

X.129.6: With sexual reproduction we've gotten as far as we can (or as the poet chooses to go) in creation – we're not going to get every last rock, tree, and critter [this is not Genesis] – so in vs. 6 we abruptly shift away to large questions that obliquely take us back to the beginning of the hymn.

X.129.7: *dadhé* – JPB takes it as passive, which I prefer. Macd as transitive, with *ádhyakṣaḥ* as presumed subject ("whether he founded it or not"; also Ge); Doniger as sort of reflexive ("perhaps it formed itself, or perhaps it did not"), and Renou's tr. (HSpéc) is mildly unparsable, at least to me ("si elle a fait l'object ou non d'une institution"), but apparently passive(-ish). Note that however we interpr. *dadhé* (save for Macd's take), this is a pretty radical sentiment: "maybe creation *didn't* happen"!

Another kind of radical: the "overseer," who may be the ultimate creator, is said to be "in highest heaven" – but in vs. 1 it was said that highest heaven didn't exist. This is ring composition (1b *vyòmā paró yát* / 7c *paramé vyòman*) with a subversive message.

X.130 Creation of the Sacrifice [SJ on JPB]

X.130.1: The instr. *devakarmébhiḥ* here is one of three forms in the RV with thematic *karmá-* (see the bahuvrīhis *vīrá-karma* X.61.5 and *viśvá-karmeṇa* X.166.4 and comm. ad locc.). In this case the *n*-stem instr. **devakarmabhiḥ* would not fit the cadence and **-a-* > *-e-* is an easy fix.

The syntax of c is entirely ambiguous, in that *pitáraḥ* could belong to the main cl., modified by *imé* ("these fathers, who came here ..."; so publ. tr., Ge, Re [HSpéc], Don) or to the rel. cl.: "It's these that weave – the fathers who came here"). It's a small difference (and difficult to render in Engl. without introducing multiple rel. clauses). Despite the almost infinitesimal distinction, I rather prefer the latter – the annunciatory near-deictic *imé* ("these are / here are") pointing to those engaged in current action, whose referents (and their history) are then specified. The "here are ..." interpr. is supported by 2c *imé mayúkhāḥ* "here are the pegs."

X.130.2: On the uncertain referent of *púmān* in this 1st hemistich, see publ. intro.

X.130.3: Since the acc. with √*yaj* is always otherwise the recipient of the sacrifice, I would substitute "when all the gods sacrificed to the god," whatever that might mean. For disc. of similar expressions, see my comm. on X.90.16 and my disc. of X.124.6 in the Staal Ged. The phrase *yajñám áyajanta* in vs. 6 is perhaps somewhat less clear.

X.130.4: There is a puzzling lack of agreement on the meaning and structure of *máhasvān*, which appears to me to be straightforwardly as rendered in the publ. tr. "gaining greatness" (*máhas* + poss. *-vant-*). Gr parses the morphology thus, but follows BR in positing a *máhas-* "Lust," hence 'sich erfreuend'), and this seems somehow reflected in Ge's "wann er mit Loblied gefeiert wird." Re's tr. (HSpéc) "lui qu'on exalte par les hymnes" does appear to contain *máhas-* 'great', but somehow transitivized. Don's "that reverberates" must reflect an analysis as *máha-svān* with √*svan* 'resound', though darkly. (AiG II.2 doesn't treat it.)

X.130.5–6: JPB takes *cākḷpre* (5d) / *cākḷpré* (6a) as transitive, supplying the obj. "(the ritual)." But medial non-causative forms to this secondary root, esp. common in the AV (both recensions), are intrans. ('be fit for', etc.) or reflexive ('arrange oneself'), acdg. to most interpr. (incl. Kü 141). I would emend both tr. here to "in (just) this way the human seers conformed themselves" (flg. Re [HSpéc] "... se sont confirmés"). In other words they followed the models provided by the gods.

X.130.6: I do not think that the rel. cl. of d is the direct object of *manye* (JPB's "I think of the ancient ones ..."), but rather, with all the standard interpr., the *páśyan manye* is a sort of phrasal verb: "I think I am seeing ..." The point is that the poet can conjure up with his mental eye a vision of the Ur-sacrificers. I would substitute "With my mind as eye, I think I am seeing those – the ancient ones who sacrificed to this sacrifice."

X.131 Indra

On the contents and later use of the hymn see publ. intro.

The hymn is structurally of an omphalos type, as shown by the Anukr.'s assignment of vss. 1–3 and 6–7 to Indra, but the (more or less) middle verses, 4–5, to the Aśvins (though Indra also appears in both). That vs. 4 is an Anuṣṭubh in an otherwise Triṣṭubh hymn also signals the structural break, though 4–5 are also responsive. (See below.)

X.131.1: The pattern of the repeated preverb in tmesis *ápa* followed by acc. pl. directional adj. creates a nice phonological effect, esp. in the first two pādas: *#ápa prā̆caḥ ... #ápā̆pācaḥ*.

X.131.2: On the interpr. of the imagery in this vs., see publ. intro. As I say there, the most obvious initial interpr. has to be set aside as the vs. continues.

X.131.3: For the interpr. of this vs., see publ. intro. I have rendered pāda a rather loosely, to capture its slightly slangy tone. As I indicate in the publ. intro., a more literal tr. would be "there exists nothing which, when drawn by a single animal, has travelled in the right way" or, per JSK DGRV I.375, "For it is not driven in the proper manner by means of a single horse." The periphrasis *yātám ásti* is somewht puzzling: I don't see the need for an overt copula. Since the overt 3rd sg. pres. of √*as* is usually existential, not copular, I have so tr. it in my literal rendering just given. But I wonder if it's there instead to make it clear that *yātám* is not the common dual impv. to √*yā* so frequently used of the Aśvins. Moreover, as I disc. in my 1990 "Tense of the Past Part." article, surface copulas are more likely to be found in subord. clauses, as here. See comm. ad VII.22.2.

On *sthū́ri* see Bl's comments (RReps ad IV.17.16); he also favors "one-horse" as an Eng. rendering.

Note that though *utá* suggests that pādas a and b are conjoined, *vivide* (b) is not accented, unlike *ásti* (a), and so cannot be in the domain of *hí* in a. JSK (loc. cit.) does not note the differential verb accentuation and seems to think that *utá* is conjoining clauses that are at least loosely parallel. I assume that *utá* in this somewhat vernacular style is simply introducing a new clause.

Ge supplies a subj. "ein solcher" for *vivide*, but I follow Gr in taking it as passive with *śrávaḥ* as subj.; this would match the passive expression in pāda a. For other pass. usages of this med. pf., see Kü 493.

The 2nd hemistich is identical to IV.17.16ab, but the sentence continues there in cd. In both places Ge supplies a main verb "call on." This is possible, but in the pub. tr. I supply "seek" semantically extracted from the *-yá-* denominatives. In IV.17.16, by contrast, I read *vājáyantaḥ* as a pun: not only 'seeking prizes', but also (as often) 'rousing'. See comm. ad loc. This is possible here as well; I now suggest an alt. tr. "inspired ones, seeking cows, seeking horses, seeking prizes / [are] rousing the bull Indra for partnership." In this case, *vājáyantaḥ* would also be a predicated pres. part.

X.131.4–5: As discussed in the publ. intro., these two vss. make brief mention of the Aśvins' healing of Indra, who got sick from drinking the liquor *surā*. This myth is treated extensively in Vedic prose, esp. in connection with the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, which seems already alluded to here, and there is abundant sec. lit. on it (see reff. in the publ. intro., also Ge's n. 4a).

As mentioned above, the two verses form a structural omphalos, as Aśvin verses in the center of an Indra hymn, though Indra is prominent in both verses. The two verses are responsive, relating (almost) the same myth, in the same words. In fact, vs. 5 appears to be a recasting of vs. 4 (in a different meter), in order to show Indra in a better light. In vs. 4 it is the Aśvins who separate-by-drinking the surā-soma: *yuvám surā́mam aśvinā ... vipipānā*, whereas in vs. 5 this feat is attributed to Indra: *yát surā́maṃ vy ápibaḥ ... maghavan*. But in both verses the Aśvins help Indra, with the same root √*av*: 4cd *índram ... āvatam* / 5b *āváthuḥ* (or, see below, **āvatuḥ*).

The word *surā́ma-* is found only in these two vss., and its meaning and formation are much disputed (see Gr, Ge n. 4a, Old, EWA s.v. *súrā-*, etc.). I favor the suggestion of Brune (cited by Old) that it is a blend, or portmanteau, of *súrā-* and *sóma-* (of the "brunch" type). It is, after all, the obj. of *ví* √*pā* 'separate in drinking' in 4c. The word also, obviously, plays off *sutrā́man-*, the epithet of Indra in vss. 6 and 7 and the base for the name of the Sautrāmaṇī ritual.

On *ví* √*pā* 'separate in drinking' see esp. comm. ad VII.22.4, I.191.10.

X.131.5: The publ. tr. conceals a grammatical problem in the first hemistich, though not a very interesting one. The Aśvins are nom. (or acc.) in pāda a, with suffixal accent *aśvínā*. But the du. verb in b is 2nd ps. *āváthuḥ*. Moreover, there is a voc. *índra*, so an extra 2nd ps. ref. The simplest solution, reflected in the tr., is Old's: read 3rd du *āvátuḥ* for *āváthuḥ*; he suggests the 2nd ps. form was influenced by *āvatam* in 5d.

X.131.6–7: These vss. are identical to VI.47.12–13, where they do not seem to have any connection to the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, unlike here. As noted above, both vss. contain the epithet *sutrā́man-*, which echoes *surā́mam* in vss. 4–5.

X.132 Mitra and Varuṇa

On the problematic nature of this hymn, see publ. intro. I will not engage deeply with the various other interpr. and in fact will not spend much time trying to justify my own -- taking as my guide Old's introductory remark: "Nur teilweise verständlich." On the hymn and esp. vs. 4, see Ingrid Eichner-Kühn, "Ein Eidbrück im Ṛgveda," MSS 41 (1982) 23–31. Her solution for the problematic hapax in 4d is brilliant and puts a very different complexion on the interpretation of the difficult vss. 4–5, but I cannot follow her in her interpr. of the whole hymn (27) as an oath-breaker's attempt, through an expiatory sacrifice to Agni, to avert Varuṇa's retribution for this offense – however ingenious this interpr. is.

X.132.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the repeated pf. mid. part. *ījāná-* seems to be identifying the role later called the "Sacrificer" (Yajamāna).

The first hemistich lacks a finite verb; something needs to be supplied to govern the loc. inf. *prabhūṣáṇi*. *Pace* Gr, Wh (Rts), AiG II2.624, it seems better to take *prabhūṣáṇi* to √*bhūṣ* 'attend on', than to √*bhū*, since *prá* √*bhū* ordinarily means 'project, dominate', not 'help' vel sim. Old is uncertain which root to choose.

X.132.2: As noted in the publ. intro., act. *yajāmasi* seems a deliberate contrast to the three exx. of the mid. part. *ījāná-* in vs. 1 and may identify the 1st pl. subjects here as the working priests. This vs. reprises some of vs. 1: in addition to the contrastive forms of √*yaj* we have *suṣumnā́* echoing *sumnaíḥ* (1d), mid. *krānā́ya*, which I take as synonymous with *ījāná-*, and *abhí* √*as* in d may pick up *abhí prabhūṣáni* in 1b (though I confess I'm not sure how).

iṣitatvátā is a remarkable piece of morphology: a double abstract (*-tva+tā-*) built to a ppl. (Somewhat similar, though built to a noun, is *puruṣatvátā-* RV 2x.) I think *iṣita-* refers to the ritual prompt to sacrifice; see, e.g., X.110.3 *sá enān yakṣīṣitáḥ* (i.e., *yakṣi iṣitáḥ*) "sacrifice to them when prompted" (cf. X.110.9, III.4.3, VI.11.1, VII.39.1).

For c, cf. VI.19.13.

X.132.3: On the interpr. of this vs., see publ. intro., where I claim that the vs. continues the opposition between the sacrificing priests and the Sacrificer. The publ. tr. would be easier to understand if parenthetical identifications were inserted: "And even now, when we [=priests] seek to establish you two [=M+V] here, while coming into possession of our own dear legacy, / or when the giver [=Sacrificer/Patron] prospers with regard to his legacy, no one shall bring his [=Sac./Patron] bounties (for us) into collision [=destroy them]."

As I say in the publ. intro. (see also comm. on X.61.11), the word *réknas-*, used twice here (b, c), is several times (I.121.5 [=X.61.11], VI.20.7, VII.40.2, possibly I.31.14 [note typo in publ. intro.], VI.16.26) used of what the gods "leave behind" (√*ric*) for the mortals at the sacrifice. Here both the sacrificing priests ("we" ab) and the Sacrificer/Patron (c) should receive part of this "legacy." In addition the Sacrificer/Patron should be distributing "bounties" (*mághāni*) to the priests (d).

On the pf. part. *dadvā́ṃs-* see Kü (238), who claims that it never takes an obj. in the RV. I think he is correct in this case, and although it is tempting to construe *réknaḥ* with *dadvā́n* (like VIII.46.15 *dadī́ réknaḥ*, which must mean 'giving a legacy'; cf. also VI.20.7), it is better to take *réknaḥ* as an acc. of respect with *púṣyati* (sim. Kü: "oder wenn ein Spender das Erbteil mehrt").

The verb in d poses two problems. On the one hand, its sandhi is ambiguous: it may represent 3rd pl. *āran* (so Pp., fld. by Lub, Re, implicitly Kü) or sg. *ārat* (Gr, Ge [n. 3d], Heenen [163], publ. tr.). (Old is uncertain.) By the former analysis *maghā́ni* is the subject, by the latter *nákiḥ*. Then there is the question of the morphological identity of either form. Whether *ārat* or *āran*, it is generally taken as an augmented thematic aorist, which would require a preterital interpr. Since I consider d to be the main clause for the parallel *yád* clauses in ab and c, which are presential (marked even further as such by the opening *ádhā cin nú* "and even now"), a preterital interpr. poses problems (see Re's attempt to wriggle out of this by emending to accented *ā́ran* with preverb *ā́*, allowing him an underlying injunctive *aran*; EVP VII.64). However, nothing prevents us from taking it as a pf. subjunctive (indic. *ā́ra* etc.), and that is the analysis I strongly favor on the basis of the structure of the vs.

I am less certain about what the pāda means, and the numerous other renderings do not help. The publ. tr. starts from the fact that in the middle *sám* √*ṛ* means 'clash together'; in the act. it could therefore mean 'cause to clash together, bring into collision' – hence destroy. I do not see a better route to interpr., but I confess I find my own solution weak.

X.132.4–5: As noted in the publ. intro., the interpr. of these two vss. is highly uncertain. (Please also note another typo in the intro.: "The first half of vs. 5 ..." should read "vs. **4**.")

X.132.4: The first half of this vs. is structured by a twist on the classic *anyá- ... anyá-* "the one ... the other" construction: the second *anyá-* is replaced by a 2nd ps. Although the apparent assignment of kingship to both Heaven (pāda a) and Varuṇa (b) is at first puzzling, in fact it can easily be interpr. within the context of the famous hymn X.124 (in my interpr.), on which see the comm. ad loc. and my 2016 "The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas" (Ged. Staal), as well as the publ. tr. of that hymn. I argue that the "divine revolution" in X.124 involves the peaceful passing of the kingship from Father Heaven (Dyauṣ Pitar) to a complementary duo, Indra and Varuṇa (see esp. X.124.5). Our hemistich here can be interpr. within the same framework, with a chronological gap between the two pādas: *previously* Heaven was consecrated (*sūyata*) as king, but *now* Varuṇa is king. Esp. telling is the placement of the voc. *asura*: it is found in pāda a between *asaú* and *dyaúḥ*, which add up to the

standard designation "yonder heaven," but it must be construed with the voc. *varuṇa* in b. But Heaven is called "Father Asura" in X.124.3 and elsewhere, while Varuṇa also frequently is so called. It is as if our poet wants to associate the word with both figures: Heaven by word order and Varuṇa by grammar.

The second hemistich is harder. In pāda c both the referent of the nom. *mūrdhā́* and the morphological identity of the verb *cākan* are up for grabs. I take *mūrdhā́* as continuing the reference to Varuṇa, from the previous pāda. This suggests that *cākan* is 2nd sg., rather than 3rd (per Gr, etc.). For both identifications, see Re's tr. (EVP V). What chariot does he take pleasure in? Obvious answers are the chariot of sacrifice or the war chariot (both have been suggested – e.g., sacrifice Scar 245, war chariot Re) – or both. If it is the latter (or partly the latter), this might help in interpr. the baffling pāda d. In the power-sharing arrangement between Indra and Varuṇa, Indra is the Kriegskönig, while Varuṇa presides over peacetime. Suggesting that Varuṇa gets pleasure from war might suggest that he is violating his nature and perhaps committing a transgression (*énas-*).

As noted above, Eichner-Kühn provides an inspired solution to the problematic hapax in pāda d. The second word of the sandhified sequence *énasāntakadhrúk* is read as *antakadhrúk* by the Pp, and all subsequent treatments of the word have started with that reading. But E-K suggest reading instead *āntakadhrúk* (which requires no emendation to the Saṃhitā text), with *ānta(ka)-* the expected ppl. to the seṭ root √*am* 'swear'. The cmpd then means 'deceiving (/breaking) an oath, a sworn agreement', and it is essentially synonymous with *mitra-drúh-*, a cmpd not found in the RV (though see *drógha-mitra-*) but attested in the MS and later and the direct correspondent to well-attested YAvestan *miϑrō.drug-*. That *āntaka-drúh-* here is meant as a substitute for the resonant and inherited Indo-Iranian technical term *mitradrúh-* is shown by the presence of *hité mitré* "when an alliance is/was concluded" in the complementary contrastive passage in the next vs, 5b.

E-K thinks this pāda means that the oath-breaker is (no longer) burdened with sin because he has performed his sacrifice to Agni, who, acdg. to her, is the subject of the preceding pāda c. But I think this requires too much backstory to be supplied – though I admit my own interpr. is pretty shaky. As hinted at above, I suggest that Varuṇa's penchant for the war chariot might have been – but is not – considered a transgression worthy of the description 'oath-breaking' – in this case breaking his power-sharing agreement with Indra. What really counts as oath-breaking is described in the first hemistich of the next vs.

X.132.5: One thing all interpreters can agree on is that 5ab must be read with 4cd, with contrastive treatments of *énas-* 'transgression', which is lodged in someone called, or described as, *śákapūta-* lit. 'shit-purified' or 'durch Mist gereinigten'. E-K (28) thinks that this personage is really Agni, and the *énas-* of the oath-breaker has been deposited (harmlessly) in this god to whom the original offender made expiatory sacrifice – i.e., it has been offered into the fire. Agni is then the subject of b, punishing others who have committed the same offense. With others I take *śákapūta* as a derogatory personal name, the negative sense of which identifies him as an enemy or someone who operates outside Ārya norms. He is the one who deserves the appellation "oath-breaker," and pāda b describes what his offense consists of: killing men who have already fallen (or have surrendered by prostrating themselves) after a peace agreement has been reached.

Note that the sandhi form *cháka(pūta)* echoes *cākan* in 4c.

As I indicate in the publ. intro., I think the 2nd half of vs. 5 belongs with vs. 6 and concerns the current ritual, where Mitra and Varuṇa are present. The description of this ritual unfolds in a series of disjointed clauses.

For *avór vā yád* I read (with Gr, Old, AiG III.535, and JSK [DGRV II.209]) **vām* for *vā*. Both of the other occurrences of *avóḥ* are fld. by *vām* (VI.67.11, VII.67.4), and *vām* could have been redactionally changed to *vā* here to match 3c *#dadvā́m̐ vā yád*. The specification with *vām* would help clarify the unusual pron. form *avóḥ*, which is, per Lub (121), probably an assimilation from *ayóḥ*. For a similar doubling see 2a *tā́ vām*. (This emendation is explicitly rejected by E-K [n. 13] and is ignored by Ge and Re, who both tr. the *vā*.)

With most (Old, Ge, Re, E-K), I take *arvā́* as a ref. to Agni as ritual fire.

X.132.5–6: Note the play: 5c *#avór* ..., 5d *#ávaḥ ... árvā#*, 6a *#yuvór* ..., 6c *áva* ...

X.132.6: The first hemistich is highly reminiscent of 1ab, which provides at least limited help in interpr. this obscure mess (as both Old and Re point out). Both passages contain *dyaúḥ ... bhū́miḥ* + LOC INF. The first help vs. 1 provides is in interpr. 6b *dyaúḥ ná bhū́miḥ*. Although Ge takes *bhū́miḥ* as the frame corresponding to *dyaúḥ* in the simile ("die Erde ... wie der Himmel"), vs. 1 suggests that they should be read as parallel and essentially conjoined "Heaven (and) Earth," with both in the simile (so also Old and Re). Placing *ná* between the two nom.s is rather like breaking up a dual dvandva with a particle.

On the loc. inf. *pupūtáni* see also Keydana (Inf. 182). Exactly who or what is being purified is unclear to me – or even whether the inf. is to be interpr. as act. or pass. In the publ. tr. I opt for an act. interpr., which would parallel *prabhūṣáṇi* in vs. 1, and assume that Aditi as a maternal figure is purifying with mother's milk, as H+E purify with rain. But I am by no means certain of any of this. Re suggests that soma is the obj. of Aditi's purification – this seems reasonable, insofar as "reasonable" is applicable to this hymn.

The identity of the 2nd pl. subjects of the verbs in cd (*áva ... didiṣṭana*, *ninikta*) is again unclear. I assume M+V plus Aditi – and whatever other gods are hanging around the sacrifice. We have finally come to the point of making our demands.

What it means to "wash with the sun's rays" is unclear to me, but it seems to be parallel to "purify with milk" in b.

X.132.7: I have nothing to contribute to the interpr. of this vs. See publ. intro.

On *apna-rā́j-* and the discrepancy between the 1st member *apna-* and putative base *ápnas-*, see Scar 446; on *dhūr-ṣád-* and *vanar-ṣád-*, Scar 567. See also Kü (223), who tr. the whole vs.

X.133 Indra

On the hymn and its connections to others in the RV, see publ. intro. It is also quite similar to the next hymn, X.134, although the Anukr. attributes them to different poets.

X.133.1: The bahuvrīhi *purorátha-* occurs once elsewhere (X.39.11), where it refers, semi-metaphorically, to a man "whose chariot is in front"—that is, who is dominant and/or victorious. Here the metaphor has been extend to describe a hymn that will prevail over the hymns of our competitors (so Ge, plausibly). My "leading chariot (of a hymn)" is meant to avoid the awkward and barely intelligible "(a hymn) whose chariot is in front."

On *śūṣá-* see esp. comm. ad X.31.3.

As noted in the publ. intro., the refrain is an elaboration on the Nābhāka Kāṇva refrain of VIII.39–42, with further use of the deprecatory low-register *-ka*-suffix.

X.133.2: Despite the pāda boundary, *adharā́caḥ* must be construed with the previous pāda, as shown by the accent on immed. flg. *áhan*, which must begin a new cl. in the middle of b.

X.133.3: The first two pādas of this vs. are illuminated by the more expansive parallel in IX.79.1 (on which see comm. ad loc.) *ví ca náśan na iṣó árātayo, aryó naśanta sániṣanta no dhíyaḥ* "If hostilities will reach our refreshments, those of the stranger will go to destruction. Our insightful thoughts will prevail." Acdg. to the clever interpr. of Old (who also discusses our passage ad IX.79.1), in IX.79.1 the two verbs *náśan* and *naśanta* can belong to different √*naś* roots – 'reach, attain' and 'disappear, go to destruction'. I adopt – but modify in details – this insight both for IX.79.1 and here. The same double sense can be seen here, but embodied in the single verb form *naśanta*, which should be interpr. as 'go to destruction' in pāda a and 'reach beyond' in b. The gen. *aryáḥ* that opens b can be read with both pādas. This interpr. is also reflected in Ge's tr.

X.133.5: The phrase *mahī́va dyaúḥ* appears to mean "like great Heaven" and, due to fem. *mahī́*, shows a fem. *dyaúḥ*, a gender assignment that is rare but not non-existent for this stem. This interpr. is reflected in the publ. tr. However, there are other possibilities. *mahī́* might by itself mean 'great (Earth)', since *mahī́* regularly refers to the earth. In this case we would have a simile exactly like that in the immed. preceding hymn X.132.6 *dyaúḥ ná bhū́miḥ* "like Heaven (and) Earth" (see comm. ad loc.), but in reversed order: "like great (Earth) (and) Heaven." Or *mahī́* might be an elliptical dual, modifying gapped *ródasī* 'the two world-halves', and specified here only by *dyaúḥ*: "the two great ones, Heaven (and Earth)." Although this might seem like a long shot, see I.22.13 *mahī́ dyaúḥ pṛthivī́ ca* with (possibly) the full expression: "the two great ones, Heaven and Earth." See comm. ad loc. I don't have a particularly strong feeling about any of the three possibilities, but given that the final vs. of this hymn (7) wishes "a great cow" to swell and give us milk, and this great cow might be the earth (though she is more likely an insightful thought [*dhī́*-]), perhaps the alt. taking *mahī́* as standing for the earth should be adopted.

X.133.5: See above ad vs. 5 on the identity of the "great cow." It is possible that this is a metaphor for the earth, but in IV.41.5cd=X.101.9cd, whose pāda d is identical to our d, the reference appears to be to a *dhī́-* 'insightful thought'; see comm. ad X.74.4.

X.134 Indra

As noted above, these two hymns, X.133 and X.134, both dedicated to Indra, are quite similar, though attributed to two different poets by the Anukr. For their similarities, see the publ. intro. to each.

X.134.1: The first 6 vss. have the same refrain, but only in this vs. is it clearly syntactically integrated into the rest of the vs.: pādas cd serve as the obj. of *ajījanat* in the refrain. (In the other vss. the obj. of the verb in the refrain must be supplied, and abcd are independent -- though see comm. on vs. 4 below.)

X.134.2–5: All four of these vss. begin with *áva*, each in tmesis with a different verb; vss. 3–4 both contain a form of *dhūnu-* 'shake down' (though in different tense/mood and voice), while 2 and 5 have verbs belonging to other roots.

X.134.2: This vs. shows esp. close connections to X.133.4 *yó naḥ ... ā́dideśati* / *adhaspadáṃ tám īm kṛdhi*, which, slightly abbreviated, is our *adhaspadáṃ tám īm kṛdhi*, *yó asmā́ṁ ā́dideśati*. The generalizing rel. cl. ("who(ever) will ...") appears before the main cl. in 133.4 and after it in 134.2, which speaks against a fixed position for this type of clause, as some Vedic syntacticians have argued.

X.134.3–4: Given the close similarity between these two vss., act. *áva ... dhūnuhi* and med. *áva ... dhūnuṣé* seem functionally identical, and in fact the act. and mid. forms of this stem in general (as well as the other, less well-attested stems to this root) are both transitive and show no obvious functional differentiation. The essential identity of the two vss. is shown also by the near repetitions *viśvá(ścandrāḥ)* (3b) / *víśvāni* (4b) and *víśvābhir ūtíbhiḥ* (3d) / *sahasríṇībhir ūtíbhiḥ* (4d).

X.134.4: Note that *víśvāni* can't directly refer to the obj. in 3 because of the change of gender, though the neut. pl. "all (things)" can be a generalized reference to it.

The obvious way to read the simile in cd is as a comparison to *víśvāni* in b – that is, as the material that Indra shakes down (all things being compared to wealth). So Ge. However, it would be possible to take it as a comparison with the implicit *tvā́m*=Indra that serves as obj. of *ajījanat* in the refrain, with Indra being compared to wealth. In this case the structure of vs. 4 would be like that of vs. 1, with cd serving as obj. to the verb in the refrain. I weakly favor this interpr., because a simile "all (things) like wealth" seems weak. The publ. tr. deliberately allows both interpr., though tipping towards the latter.

X.134.5: It is not clear whether pāda c goes with d (so Ge) or ab (publ. tr.). Ge gives no explan. for why he thinks the blades of dūrva grass would be compared to 'malevolence' (*durmatíḥ*); perhaps the near coincidence of their initial syllables (*dū́r-* / *dur-*) is sufficient. I connect b with what precedes, because the multiple blades of grass could be compared (at least in number) to beads of sweat and missiles. Macdonell and Keith (s.v. Dūrvā) make the baffling comment about our passage: "A simile occurring in the Rigveda seems to indicate that the ears lay horizontal with the stem," which deduction seems to suit neither ab nor d.

X.134.6: On the *aṅkuṣá-* in general and this image in particular, see the extensive disc. ad X.44.9. Anyone familiar with goats will recognize this scene: the goat, standing on its hind legs, uses its forefeet to pull down a branch so it can graze on the leaves (see images on internet). The question is what is the obj. in the frame that would correspond to the branch (*vayā́m*) in the simile? I think that the branch should be read in both simile and frame, since, as Ge points out, this vs. picks up the "shake down" imagery of vss. 3–4. Indra is obviously using the hook on the *aṅkuṣá-* (see X.44.9) to shake a fruit-laden branch. See Ge's n. 6ab, though he doesn't seem to recognize the relationship of the goat to the branch.

It is quite possible that *śákti-* is a pun, meaning both 'ability' and 'spear'; Ge (n. 6ab) suggests this as an alternate. Although the 'spear' meaning is generally confined to later texts (though see II.39.7), this kind of passage with its homely pastoral image is a context in which

words in use in a lower register are likely to show up. I would now slightly alter the tr. to "Because you carry your ability/spear ..."

Note also that *śáktim* (b) picks up *śácībhiḥ śakra* in 3c.

X.134.7: This final vs. is in a different meter and lacks the refrain of the rest of the hymn. It also expands from Indra to the gods in general.

The obj(s). to *minīmasi* and *ā́ yopayāmasi* must be supplied. The former verb takes a wide variety of objects, but esp. *vratā́ni* 'commandments'. √*yup* is of course far less common; of the objects with which it is found, *dhárma* (VII.89.5) 'foundations, ordinances' is closest to *vratá-* and the apparent purport of our passage. With Gr, therefore, it makes sense to extract *mántra-* from *mantra-śrútyam*, which serves as the obj. of the third 1st pl. verb *carāmasi* and supply *mántrān* 'solemn utterances' as the obj. of the 1st two verbs.

The 2nd member of *mantra-śrútyam* found only here seems to be independent of the fairly well-attested, formally identical gerundival *śrútya-* 'worthy to be heard, worthy of fame'. AiG II.2.284, 288 points to a number of pairs of root noun and associated *-ya-* form, and that seems the best way to account for this compound, which must then mean 'the hearing of (➔ obedience to) mantras'.

The final verb of the hymn *abhí sáṃ rabhāmahe* recalls *ā́ rabhāmahe* in the previous hymn (X.133.6) and is another index of their connection. Ge (n. 7cd) thinks that the reference here is to horseback riding, with the subject grabbing onto the horse (=Indra by his interpr.) with his thighs. The introduction of the horse and rider seems abrupt and unnecessary to me; I merely thought that we were grabbing the gods (pāda a; note that Indra is absent from the vs.) by *their* sides and shoulders. On *apikakṣá-* as 'region of the armpit, shoulder blade' (against Ge's "Gurt"), see my 1987 Vedic Body Parts (Ged. Cowgill), p. 84.

X.135 Yama

Another famous hymn with a plethora of competing interpr. Since I have treated the hymn at length myself ("The Earliest Evidence for the Inborn Debts of the Brahmin: A New Interpretation of Ṛgveda X.135" – *Journal asiatique* 302 [2014]: 245–57), I will not discuss the hymn in detail here but refer interested readers to the art. cit.

The hymn is framed by conceptual ring composition: the first and last verses (1 / 7) depict the delightful seat of Yama, to which the dead make their way. The three middle verses (3–5) concern the/a chariot, which can be both the chariot that takes the dead father to Yama's world and the chariot of the sacrifice. These verses form an omphalos, signaled not only by the presence of the chariot in all three, but by near matching verse openings: 3a/4a *yáṃ kumāra ...* / 5a *káḥ kumārám ...*, with 3a and 4a identical, but 5a variant. The omphalos structure is further crosscut by responsion between vss. 5 and 6: 5d and 6a are identical save for word order.

X.135.1–2: In my view, these two vss. are spoken by a boy whose dead father has made the journey to Yama's world, where he now lives pleasantly, drinking with the gods in the shade of a tree. The boy, missing his father and longing to see him again, decides to follow the same path – but he is also apprehensive and reluctant to undertake the journey – a plausible psychological portrait of a bereft child.

The pairing of the vss. is underscored by the near repetition in the first pāda of 2 of the last pāda of 1: 1d *purāṇā́ṁ ánu venati* / 2a *purāṇā́ṁ anuvénantam*.

X.135.2: I take the intens. *acākaśam* in the same way as *vicākaśat* in VIII.91.2 (Apāla), as a frequentative 'keep looking'.

X.135.3–4: These vss. concerning the (metaphorical) chariot are likely to be spoken by the father, since the speaker addresses the previous speaker familiarly with the voc. 'lad' (*kumāra* 3a, 4a).

Again the pairing is signaled verbally: 3a #*yáṃ kumāra ... rátham* / 4a #*yáṃ kumāra ... rátham*.

X.135.4: In the last pāda of these paired vss., a boat makes a sudden surprising appearance: the chariot is set on it (*nāvy āhitam*), as if on a car ferry. Although the RVic funeral hymns (X.14–18) give no sign that there's a River Styx-like barrier between this world and the next, there's at least a hint of this in X.56, a hymn focusing on the afterlife. The last vs. (X.56.7) begins *nāvā́ ná kṣódaḥ pradíśaḥ pṛthivyā́ḥ, svastíbhir áti durgā́ṇi víśvā* "As if with a boat across the swell through all the earth's directions, (having gone) beyond the difficult places with blessings," apparently describing the journey to the next world -- though the boat there is in a simile.

X.135.5: As noted above, this vs. both forms a part of a three-verse omphalos (3–5) concerning the chariot and signaled by near-matching verse openings, but also pairs with vs. 6. For the connection of 5 to 3–4, note also the near-matching verb phrases 4ab *yám ... prā́vartayo rátham* ... "which chariot you sent rolling forth" and 5b *rátham kó nír avartayat* "Who sent the chariot rolling out?"

X.135.5–6: These vss. are paired both by the difficult and much discussed word *anudéyī* and by the crucial structural fact that vs. 5 poses questions and vs. 6 begins by answering one in almost the same words (though see below for a crucial interpretational shift): 5d *anudéyī yáthā́bhavat*, 6a *yáthā́bhavat anudéyī*.

As I have disc. *anudéyī* at length in the 2014 art. (esp. 247–50), I will not repeat the details here. The gist is that I interpr. the word in the context of an AV passage (and its Vedic prose parallels), which contains an idiom *ṛṇám ánu* √*dā* 'forgive a debt' in the context of Yama's world. The gerundive here is part of an underlying phrase "(debt) to be forgiven"; its fem. gender (versus the neut. of *ṛnám*) is due to the metaphor found in the AV (etc.) passages: the "rope (of debt)" (with fem. *rájju-* 'rope'). The debt in our passage is in reference to what later become the trio of debts a brahmin owes on birth, one of which is to produce a son. In the RV, I suggest, there was only a two-debt system: beget a son and perform sacrifice, since the system of studentship was only just developing in this period. In our vs. Yama asks the father, who has arrived at Yama's world, about the two debts and whether they have been discharged. The father answers affirmatively.

X.135.6: The result of this positive answer is that the father is reborn in Yama's world, a birth depicted, with technical terminology, in 6bcd. The trick to interpr. the two vss. is to see that although 5d *anudéyī yáthā́bhavat* and 6a *yáthā́bhavat anudéyī* are identical except for word order, *yáthā* is being used in two different senses: "how" in 5d, "as" in 6a.

X.135.7: This final vs. pairs with vs. 1, describing the delights of Yama's world, into which the father has been reborn.

X.136 Muni

On the subject of this hymn and its similarity to the Laba-sūkta (X.119), see publ. intro. As with the next hymn (X.137), the Anukr. assigns each of its vss. to a different poet – in this case the seven (unsung) sons of the muni Vātaraśana, a name plucked from the bahuvrīhi 'wind-girt' (lit. 'whose halter is the wind') in vs. 2.

As noted in the publ. intro., the word *viṣá-* 'poison', the substance that the muni drinks, occurs only in the first and last (7) verses of the hymn. It's also notable that *keśín-* 'long-haired' is found 5x in vs. 1, once in the 2nd hemistich of vs. 6 and once in the last vs. The distribution of both these items certainly hints at ring composition.

X.136.1: Pāda c lacks a verb. The most obvious way to construe the pāda is to supply 'bears' from pāda b, though there's a wide variety of other interpr.

X.136.2: The expression "when the gods have entered (them)" is striking. In this context it presumably means they have been en-theos-ed – possessed -- as it were.

X.136.5: All consulted tr. interpr. the first member of *devéṣita-* as pl. ("impelled by the gods"). But given the focus on the wind in pāda a (also 2a, c), I take it as a sg. ref. to Vāyu.

Pāda d contains a novel twist on the izafe-like nominal rel. cl.: the sg. nom. *yáḥ* has a dual as its antecedent, *ubhaú samudraú*, and the rel. cl. contains two conjoined sg. adjectives, corresponding to the dual antecedent. The clause also begins (*yáś ca*) as if it were going to belong to an "X and which Y" construction, in which the X would belong to the main cl. and have the appropriate case for that cl. (acc. in this instance). However, both X and Y are found in the *yáś ca* clause, both nom.

X.136.6: Since the muni is flying in the midspace, I take *mṛgá-* here as 'wild bird', not the more general sense 'wild animal' (which of course is narrowed in a different direction to 'deer' in later Skt.). The Avestan cognate *mərəγa-* means 'bird', and other RVic passages seem to call for that sense. Cf. esp. I.182.7 *parṇā̃ mṛgásya patáruḥ* "the feathers of a wild bird in flight"; IX.32.4 *mṛgó ná taktáḥ* "like a wild bird launched in flight" (comparable to IX.67.15 *śyenó ná taktáḥ* "like a falcon launched in flight"). See also comm. ad IX.32.4.

Apropos *kétasya vidvā̃n* Ge appositely adduces *kéta-vedas-* I.104.3.

The adjectives *svādúr madíntamaḥ*, modifying the muni, seem meant to evoke soma, just before (vs. 7) the poison drink reappears.

X.136.7: The preparation of the poison drink in ab mimics that of soma.

This vs. rouses great excitement in scholars of the history of Indian religion as the (possible) "oldest reference to the Rudra-Śiva cult of traditional Indian civilization" (Maurer, comm. on vs. 7). Since this topic has been (more than) sufficiently treated by others, I reserve comment.

X.137 All Gods

As with the immed. preceding hymn X.136, the Anukr. attributes each vs. of this hymn to a different poet, but unlike the unrenowned poets of X.136, these are the celebrated Seven Seers

(Saptarṣi). However, as noted in the publ. intro., the elementary contents of the hymn do not justify the exalted ascriptions.

X.137.1: This vs. seems to be overstuffed with pointless repetitions: four (!) voc. "o gods," one in each 8-syllable pāda, an *utá* opening each hemistich, and *púnaḥ* ending each one. This leaves each pāda with just four syllables to convey content.

X.137.2: The two occurrences of *ā́* + ABL in b might appear to express parallel senses ("from X, from Y")(so Lub, for AVP V.18.3), but because of the contrastive directions of the winds in cd, I follow the standard interpr. (Ge, Re, Wh [AVŚ IV.13.2]), which takes the first *ā́* as 'from' and the second as 'to'.

X.137.5: Both AV versions read *imám* for *ihá*, which makes more sense: an absolute use of √*trā* 'rescue' is awk.

X.138 Indra

On the contents of this hymn and some of its difficulties, see publ. intro.

X.138.1: The first hemistich is quite straightforward: the conveyors (*váhnayaḥ*) are conveyors of songs, the Aṅgirases (as in VI.32.3) of the Vala myth, who also stand in for the present-day priests. The opening of the Vala cave by the Aṅgirases in conjunction with Indra is of course standard fare.

The second hemistich is more problematic, in great part because of its syntactic ambiguity. The two verbal forms in c, *daśasyán* and *riṇán*, can be either nom. sg. masc. pres. participles or 3rd pl. act. injunctives (accented because in a *yátrā* cl.). In the former case, the part. modify the 2nd sg. subj. of *daṃsáyaḥ* in d, namely Indra; in the latter, the subj. continues to be the *váhnayaḥ*. Ge, Old, and the publ. tr. take them as part.; Gr, Lü (534–35), and HPS (B+I 145–46) as 3rd pl. There is no way to tell for certain; I just wonder if so much credit would be given to the Aṅgirases and so little to Indra in this vs. Note that the next vs. (2abc) contains five 2nd sg. verbs with Indra as subject. Moreover, in my interpr., having cd a single cl. simplifies the interpr. of *ca* in d (see below).

Ge (fld. by JSK [DGRV I.127]) supplies a verb in d: "(beistandest)" to construe with *kútsāya mánman*; this is presumably a form of √*av* 'help', but he doesn't say (and rather obfuscates in n. 1d; though JSK explicitly supplies *ávīḥ*) – but √*av* doesn't ordinarily take the dat. (or the loc.). He (also JSK) assumes (n. 1d) that *ca* connects this ghost clause with *ahyàś ca daṃsáyaḥ*. But I see no reason to manufacture a verb that doesn't fit the very elements it's meant to be construed with.

The interpr. of this pāda is not helped by the fact that the verb *daṃsáyaḥ* is a hapax, though it very probably belongs with *dáṃsiṣtha-* 'most wondrous', *-dáṃsa-* 'wondrous power,' *dáṃsas-* 'id.', etc.; a form of *dáṃsas-* is found in the next vs. (2c). See my *-áya-* monograph (p. 83). Here it clearly governs *ahyàḥ* 'fertile cows' in its immediate vicinity; I suggest that it can also be taken with the fem. acc. pl.s in c, *apáḥ* and quite possibly *uṣásaḥ*, and that the *ca* in d signals this conjoining. All three are multiforms, as it were, of the females released from the Vala cave; see 2a. What then does *daṃsáya-* mean (assuming its connection to the 'wondrous power' words)? In the publ. tr. I render it "exerted your wondrous power"; in the *-áya-* book

"made capable (of bearing)." I see no way to decide, but I would now allow the second interpr. as an alternative.

As for *kútsāya mánman*, we should start by pointing out (with HPS 146) that Kutsa is out of place here, since he has no part in the Vala myth ordinarily. In the publ. intro. I suggest (or hint) that he's being kept in reserve, as it were, for vs. 3, the theft of the wheel of the Sun, in which myth Kutsa regularly figures. Lü (/HPS) think that the thought is Indra's, on behalf of Kutsa (Lü: "im Gedenken für Kutsa"; HPS same except "an Kutsa"), but Old asserts that *mánman-* is almost always that of a human and so it should not be Indra's thought. Here I think the *mánman-* is Kutsa's product, a hymn or sim. for Indra, and in response Indra then acts on his behalf.

X.138.2: This vs. continues the account of the Vala myth, here with Indra the dominant actor.

Note that of the five parallel verbs in abc, only one, *śvañcáyaḥ* (a), is unaugmented.

The "fecond females" (*prasvàḥ*) in pāda a are, in my opinion, all three feminines from 1c, the dawns, the waters, the fertile cows – different designations for the beings imprisoned in the Vala cave.

The sticking point in this sequence of 2nd sg. actions is the referent of *asya* in c. One expects the wondrous power to be Indra's, esp. after reciting his series of wondrous deeds, but I know of no instances where *asya* (vel sim.) has 2nd ps. reference. Since *asya* is unaccented, it should refer to something already in the discourse. Ge (n. 2c) suggests either soma (b) or the sun (d); Lü (519) opts for the sun. I'd prefer not to have a referent that follows, even as closely as pāda d, and think soma is much likelier on other grounds as well. The publ. tr. reflects what I now think is an over-complex and artificial interpr., that *vanín-* 'wooden' refers to the wooden cups Indra drinks soma from, and by soma's power he strengthened them. I now see that there's a simpler and more satisfying solution, found already in my *-áya-* book (p. 83 n. 10), that Indra did all these deeds (not only the one in c, but those in the first hemistich) through (soma's) wondrous power: that is, as usual, drinking soma gave Indra the strength and skill to perform his great deeds. I would now substitute the tr. "you released the fecund females (etc.) ... you made the trees grow – by its (=soma's) wondrous power."

X.138.3: The last three pādas belong together, as an account of Indra's defeat of Pipru for Ṛjiśvan, but the relevance of pāda a is unclear. However, the stealing of the sun's wheel and the defeat of Pipru are found together elsewhere (see, e.g., IV.16.12–13).

The Ārya is Ṛjiśvan, the Dāsa Pipru, and it is Indra who's the "match" (*pratimā́nam*).

X.138.3–4: These two verses, at the exact center of the hymn, show phrasal concatenation: 3cd *dṛḷhā́ni ... vy ā́syat* "he threw open the firm (fortifications)" and 4a *ánādhṛṣṭāni ... vy ā́syat* "he threw open open the undefiable (fortifications)." Although this type of responsion hints at an omphalos, the hymn is so disorganized that I'm not sure this signal should be pursued.

X.138.4: The problem in this vs. is localized at the beginning of c, *māséva sū́ryaḥ*. What the sun and moon are doing here is unclear, made harder to interpr. by the lack of scholarly agreement on the form of 'moon'. See Old's disc. As it stands, it must be *māsā́* and an instr., but Ge (n. 4c) wants to see it as irreg. sandhi for gen. **māsás iva* "wie die Sonne (den Glanz) des Mondes," which requires too much machinery and doesn't match any known myth. Better to accept the sandhi form we have and take the instr. moon as parallel to the likewise instr. "flashing

(weapon)" (*virúkmatā*) at the end of the pāda. Although a myth in which the sun uses the moon as a weapon is also unknown, it doesn't require altering the text.

X.138.5: Like *daśasyán* and *riṇán* in 1c, *dā́śat* in c could be either a 3rd sg. injunc. (accented because it opens the pāda) or a nom. sg. m. pres. part., although there is less riding on the decision than in 1c, since Indra is the subj. in either case. I opt for the part. (so Old) – Gr and Ge for the finite verb.

X.138.6: On the obscure contents of this vs. and their possible relationship to vss. 3–4, see publ. intro.

X.139 Sūrya

On the links between this hymn and the immed. preceding one (X.138) see publ. intro. I do not understand the contents of the hymn and will not try to explain its larger purpose.

X.139.1: The tr. of the bahuvrīhis *sū́ryaraśmiḥ* and *hárikeśaḥ* by "with" make them sound like instr.; to clarify, better "Savitar, having the rays of the sun and golden hair ..."

X.139.2–4: Note the emphasis on sight and visual survey: 2a, 3b *nṛcákṣāḥ*, 2c *abhí caṣte*, 4b *dadṛśúṣīḥ*, 4d *pári ... apaśyat*.

X.139.2: The referents of the two fem. pl.s in c, *viśvā́cīḥ* and *ghṛtā́cīḥ*, are unclear and disputed. Since the latter, 'facing towards ghee', is obviously the more semantically limited, it seems best to determine its referent and go from there. The first alternative in the publ. tr., "mares," is based on VII.60.3 *harítaḥ ... ghṛtā́cīḥ*, in a hymn to Sūrya and Mitra-Varuṇa, in a vs. also concerning visually surveying the world. Re supplies "sacrificial ladles" (my 2nd alt.) on the grounds of VIII.44.5 *juhvàḥ ... ghṛtā́cīḥ*; see also VII.43.2–3, where 'ladles' is obviously to be supplied and they are characterized as *ghṛtā́cīḥ* (2b) and (sg.) *viśvā́cī* (3c). In the sg. *ghṛtā́cī-* regularly refers to the ladle (see Gr's def. 3). There are other possibilities: Lü (539) supplies "quarters, directions" (*díśaḥ*, already Sāy., Gr), which better fits the cosmic context here, but requires a metaphorical stretch (which, as always, Lü is ready to make). Unfortunately there are no parallels. Ge (see n. 2c) weakly prefers *dhíyaḥ* 'thoughts'; see I.2.7 *dhíyaṃ ghṛtā́cīm* and, with a synonym, VII.5.5 *gíraḥ ... ghṛtā́cīḥ*. The presence of *dhíyaḥ* in 5d (twice) might support his choice. I do not find any of these suggestions particularly compelling, though I would now downgrade 'mares' and add 'quarters' as the preferred alt.

X.139.3: On *samará-* see comm. ad VI.9.2.

X.139.4: I have no idea what is going on in this vs. For an elaborate account see Lü (539–41), who thinks it deals with Indra finding the sun, aided by the Gandharva. See also Ge's extensive notes.

X.139.5: On pāda c, see comm. on the identity pāda ad V.85.8.

On the precative *avyās* see comm. ad II.38.10.

X.139.6: This vs. presents a reassuringly recognizable account of the opening of the Vala cave (at least in b) and has echoes of the first vss. of the previous hymn, X.138.

X.140 Agni

On the varied meter of the hymn, see publ. intro.

X.140.2: The first pāda is striking with its three bahuvrīhis with *-varcas-*. It is also two syllables too long; I wonder if this an iconic overkill reflection of the 1st member of the final cmpd, *ánūna-* 'without lack/deficiency'.

Although act. *íyarti* is usually transitive, Gr identifies a few intrans. exx., like IV.45.1, also adduced by Ge (n. 2b). However, that passage is probably tr. (see comm. ad loc.). Two close parallels with transitive forms give me pause: X.37.4 *jágac ca víśvam udiyárṣi bhānúnā*; X.75.3 *śúṣmám úd iyarti bhānúnā*. However, in the absence of any obvious thing to supply, best to accept the intrans. sense, which cannot be entirely excluded in a few other passages (e.g., I.165.4).

The "two mothers" in c are most likely Heaven and Earth, given the cosmic contents of the flg. pāda. But in an Agni context the two kindling sticks are always a possibility, esp. with Agni identified as *putráḥ*. (And both, of course, could be meant.)

In d *pṛṇákṣi* would be better rendered 'pervade' or 'permeate', to distinguish it from a form of √*prā*. However, the matching form in 4d cannot be interpr. that way.

X.140.3: In b *hitáḥ* is ambiguous; it can be the ppl. of both √*dhā* and √*hi* and in this case is surely meant to be read as both.

In cd the distribution of nominals is unclear. Although *íṣaḥ* could be the nom. subj., it is much more likely to be the acc. obj., with "gods" as subj., on the basis of Ge's parallels (n. 3cd) I.80.15, VII.82.2. *citrótayaḥ* must be nom. pl. and therefore modify the gods (if they are indeed the subj.), but *bhū́rivarpasaḥ* and *vāmájātāḥ* can be either nom. pl. (masc.) or acc. pl. fem. I take both as modifying *íṣaḥ*. III.53.1 *vāmī́r íṣaḥ* "precious nourishments" supports a connection of *vāmá-* and *íṣ-*, and the *vāmá- / íṣ-* nexus in 5c is even stronger evidence. The fact that *bhū́ri vāmám* is a fixed phrase (I.33.3, etc.) may attract *bhū́ri-varpas-* into the orbit. Others distribute them differently: Gr takes both as nom. pl. m. as does Re; in his tr. Ge takes *bhū́ri-varpas-* with *íṣaḥ*, but *vāmájātāḥ* with the subj. (though see his uncertainty in n. 3c). In fact, the distribution matters little.

X.140.4: Note *iraj-* (a) : *ví rāj-* (c).

I interpr. *prathayasva* as a real medial causative, with reflexive sense: "cause yourself to be extended."

Note *pṛṇákṣi*, which matches the same form in 2d; see comm. there on the difference in meaning.

X.140.5: Most of this vs. is couched in the acc., but the acc. phrases in ab and cd have distinct referents: while cd describes the various good things Agni establishes, the accusatives in ab must refer to Agni himself. This hemistich is syntactically untethered: there is no verb to govern the acc.s in ab. Old suggests that the phrase anticipates 6b *agním ... dadhire puráḥ*, and I have adopted this solution.

On *íṣ* √*kṛ*, see comm. ad VII.76.2. As I say there, though *íṣ* behaves like a pseudo-preverb in this lexeme, its source is probably the noun *íṣ-* 'refreshment, nourishment', and here that sense still (or again) seems to be present. Note *íṣam* in c as well as *íṣaḥ* prominent in 3c.

X.140.6: *sapráthastama-* echoes 4a *prathayasva*.

X.141 All Gods

X.141.1–2: The opening of 1c, *prá no yacha*, is picked up by 2a *prá no yachatu*, and the four repeated *prá*-s in b and c prolong the idiom with a series of different gods. But 2d introduces a new verb, *dadātu*, which responds to 1d *(dhana-)dā́ḥ*.

X.141.3–4: These two vss. are likewise structured by a shared verb, *havāmahe* (3b, 4b) here with a series of objects.

X.141.5–6: Here the shared verbal expression is *dā́nāya codaya* (5b, 6d). Its construction varies, however: in 5 the obj.s of *codaya* / subj.s of the infinitive are in the acc. (*aryamáṇam* ...), but in 6 the obj./subj. has been attracted into the dat. (*devátātaye*) to match the infinitive (as often). So also Old and Ge.

X.142 Agni

On the structure of the hymn, see publ. intro. Since it is found in a group of six-vs. hymns, it is two vss. too long. But the last two vss., in dimeter meter, appear to be an appended charm.

Preverbs/nominal prefixes are esp. prominent and effectively deployed in this hymn. The sharp contrast between aggressively active *úd* 'up' and gently settling *ní* 'down' is found several times (4a, 5d [extra *ní* in b], 6c [extra *úd*-s in 6ab]), with the calming charm having further *ní*-s in 7ab. See also the *prá*-s in 2a, c, 4b, d, and the *ánu*-s of 4c, 5cd (supplied in 5b), as well as the contrastive *ā́-* and *parā́-* in 8a.

X.142.1: This vs. contains two forms of accented *ásti* (b, c). The first is existential, as overt forms of the 3rd sg. pres. to √*as* generally are, since it is ordinarily gapped in copular usage. However, the form in c does appear to be the copula; an existential interpr. – "for there exists auspicious shelter of [=from] you ..." – can be constructed but seems artificial. Here accent is the crucial factor; as I demonstrated in my 1990 "Tense of the Predicated Past Participle in Vedic" (IIJ 33), pp. 4–5, accented 3rd sg. pres. copulas are optionally allowed.

Re points out the phonological play in the final words of a and b: *ápi*#, *ā́p*^{i}*yam*#,

X.142.2: There is no agreement about the etymology, morphology, meaning, or even the length of final vowel of *sācī́*. See KEWA and EWA, both s.v. *sākám*, Gr, Old, Re (EVP XIV.99); the use of the simile particle (*sācī́va*) may signal a certain vagueness on the part of the composer. For want of a clear alternative, I follow the (K)EWA line and connect it with *sākám* 'at once, all together', though I have no particular confidence in this interpr.

X.142.3: The sense of *utá ... utá* is not clear. Ge "bald ... bald"; Re "tantôt ... tantôt"; JSK (DGRV I.456) "sometimes ... at other times." But JSK gives no other exx. of this usage, and I do not see why it's not merely additive "and ... and" – as if in a somewhat breathless play-by-play.

The lexeme *pári* √*vṛj* usually has the idiomatic sense 'avoid', a development of its literal sense 'twist/bend around'. Although the other tr. (Ge, Old, Re, Th [Gedichte], JSK [DGRV I.456]) take the verb in its idiomatic sense here ('spare, avoid'), I think the literal one works better: the forest fire takes a twisting and unpredictable course putting all vegetation at risk – rather than sometimes sparing trees and bushes, sometimes not.

X.142.4: More phonological, morphological, and etymological echoes: *udvát-*, *nivát-* flg. *pravát* in 2a; then b *pṛ́thag pragardh-*, c *vā́to ... -vā́ti*, d *vápteva ... vapasi*.

X.142.5: The other tr. (Ge, Re, Th) take b as containing two parallel phrases in the nom.: "one downward course, many chariots" – presumably referring to the single fire with its many flames. I prefer to take *ékaṃ niyā́nam* as an acc. of extent, supplying *ánu* found in c and d (and 4c), but I would certainly allow the alternative.

Another echo: b *bahávo* ... c *bāhū́*. It seems a bit strange that a raging forest fire would have only two arms (i.e., branching divisions), but the bodily metaphor may have overrriden the physical image.

X.142.6: As indicated in the publ. tr., this vs. abruptly returns us from the forest fire to the ritual fire, which, however, shows the same type of intense movement as the forest fire.

There are several different ways to interpr. b, particularly the referent of *śaśamānásya*. Because of the *úd* that opens the pāda, repeating the two *úd*-s of pāda a, the skeletal structure of b seems clear (to me): the verb *jihatām* should be supplied from pāda a, and the nom. *vā́jāḥ* is grammatically parallel to *śúṣmāḥ* and *arcíḥ* in pāda a, though it does not belong to the same semantic realm as the other two, which describe Agni's physical characteristics. These assumptions about the structure of b are not shared by all other tr. Ignoring the repeated *úd*, Ge simply supplies a different verb "(sollen) ... (kommen)," presumably in tacit recognition of the different semantics of *vā́jāḥ* ("Belohnungen" for him). Th replicates the structure, but alters the sense of *vā́jāḥ* to "Kräfte" to accord better with the nominatives in pāda a. Only Re keeps both the structure and the usual sense of *vā́ja-*: "Que tes crépitements éclatent haut, haute la flamme, hauts tes prix-de-victoire ..." All (incl. Gr) take *śaśamānásya* to be coreferent with *te*, referring to Agni, who is performing his ritual labors. This is certainly possible. But in contrast I think it refers to the human officiant. Although *śaśamāná-* can modify Agni (e.g., X.11.5), more often it qualifies the human laboring *for* Agni. See, e.g., I.141.10 *tvám agne śaśamānā́ya sunvaté, rátnam ... invasi* "You, o Agni, impel treasure ... to the man who labors and presses soma," where Agni rewards the human ritualist. I think the same situation is depicted here: the prizes are for the *śaśamāná-*, and the *te* is a dat. to be construed with that part. The attendance of the Vasus in d provides a parallel set of officiants from the divine world.

X.142.7–8: In both these vss. *samudrá-* should be tr. 'gathered waters' vel sim., rather than 'sea', since in both cases (but esp. 8) the scene is a lushly watered landscape, not the boundary between land and a large body of water. I'd now substitute "here the settling down of the gathered waters" and "these are the homes of the gathered waters."

X.142.7: Here the wild fire is deflected away from the peaceful place of waters.

Init. *anyám* is a good example of my rule of placement for *anyá-*: indefinite forms take initial position.

X.143 Aśvins

See publ. intro. on the contents of the hymn and the identity of its poet.

X.143.1: Old is esp. insightful on this vs., often flg. Baunack.

The first hemistich is couched in the acc. but lacks a verb to govern the acc. phrase. Various verbs have been suggested, but the most likely semantically, and the easiest to implement, is to borrow the verb from cd (√*kṛ*) or indeed the whole verb phrase (*návaṃ* √*kṛ*) (so, more or less, Old, alt. for Re). "Make new" ➔ "make young" fits nicely with *ṛtajúram*, which probably means 'grown old in/by truth' (see Scar 164) and may well refer to growing old in ritual labor, as we find, for ex., in the Agastya-Lopāmudrā hymn, I.179 (sugg. by Old). Although it would be possible just to supply a form of √*kṛ* to govern the inf., as a periphrastic caus., "make Atri to drive ...," context favors the fuller VP.

I take *yádī* in c not as 'if', with final-vowel lengthening, but as yet another ex. of my **yád ī* "when him ..." ("Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm*," Fs. Cardona, 2002).

This allusion to "making Kakṣīvant [the well-known poet of I.116–26] new" is supposedly supported by I.51.13 (so Ge, n. 1cd, flg. Baunack), though that passage is not all that supportive: it simply states that Indra gave K. a little female named Vṛcayā. As Ge also points out, however, the real comparandum is with Cyavāna, whom the Aśvins definitely rejuvenate in V.74.5, X.39.4 (etc.).

X.143.2: This vs. is quite problematic both in syntax and in contents, and a number of different solutions have been suggested; my interpr. differs from all of them. What we have to hold onto is the fact that vss. 1 and 2 begin the same way, 1ab *tyáṃ cid átrim ... áśvaṃ ná ...*, 2a *tyáṃ cid áśvaṃ ná ...*, both with an acc. phrase with no verb to govern it and a comparison to a horse. I therefore avail myself of the same strategy I used in vs. 1, to supply the verb for ab from cd – in this case *ví ṣyatam* 'untie, unloose'.

The referent of *areṇávaḥ* 'dustless' is unclear; Gr, Old, Ge, and Re opt for 'gods', which seems to me to create more problems than it solves. (Moreover, though the Maruts are once so identified, the gods themselves are not.) Of the eight occurrences of *areṇú-*, two modify 'paths' (I.35.11, 163.6) and one (VI.62.6, an Aśvin hymn) a measure of distance, *yójana-*. In all three passages the adj. 'dustless' signifies the ease of travel: note the presence of *sugá-* 'easy to go (on)' in I.35.11 and I.163.6. I supply paths here as well: the dustless paths stretching towards the unloosed horse are an image of the open road, promising a journey without obstacles or discomforts.

In d I supply 'stretch' as well, to govern *rájaḥ* (so, more or less, Ge's 2d, though not reflected in his tr.), though now I think a more neutral verb like 'travel, drive' (from *yā́tave* in 1b) might be better.

X.143.3: The expression *átraye ... síṣāsataṃ dhíyaḥ* has given interpr. fits, because (they think) the Aśvins should not be winning insights for Atri; rather *his* insights should themselves win, as in the immed. preceding hymn, X.142.2 *prá saniṣanta no dhíyaḥ* and (if *dhíyam* is to be supplied there) in our 5d. This has led to some over-complex and awkward tr., like Scar's (531) "...

wünscht dem Atri, dass seine Dichtungen den Sieg davon tragen," where the desiderative feature of *síṣāsatam* is attributed to the Aśvins, but the "winning" feature to the insights, a functional split that I don't think is grammatically legitimate. I think we can take the syntax at face value: the Aśvins are trying to jumpstart Atri's poetic powers by supplying him with some insights to work with. The gods regularly give *dhī̆-* to their praisers; see, e.g., VIII.86.2, where the Aśvins *dhíyaṃ dadathuḥ*; X.64.12, where an array of gods ... *me dhíyam ... ádadāta*.

In c although *divó narā* doesn't have the expected (lack of) accent for a voc. phrase, it surely should be taken as such. See Ge (n. 3c); Old disc. at length and favors splitting *diváḥ* off from the voc. and construing it with the rest of the hemistich, though without figuring out exactly how.

The dat. inf. *viśáse* is universally taken to *ví* √*śaṃs*, a lexeme that barely exists (despite the many many occurrences of the root √*śaṃs*). Of the two occurrences identified by Gr., only VIII.1.1 *ví śaṃsata* is a certain example (though with an uncertain sense and a likely nonce creation; see comm. ad loc.); III.39.2 #*ví ... śasyámānā*# would show tmesis in a participle, which is not common, and the *ví* seems to add nothing and is ignored by tr. I suggest our infinitive actually belongs to *ví* √*śas* 'carve up', attested in *viśásana-*, *(a-)viśastár-*, and the finite form *ví śasta*. (This root affiliation is explicitly rejected by Old, but with no grounds given.) The sense here is that if the Aśvins help Atri gain poetic insights, the praise-song (*stóma-*) he produces for them will not have to be carved up and parcelled out.

X.143.4: Ge considers *sádane* and *sámane* to be contrastive, with the first referring to the seat of the sacrifice and the second to contest or battle. However, *sámana-* is often an assembly or festive gathering, and I take this rhyming pair here as referring to parts of the sacrifice to which the Aśvins are bringing the poet and his colleagues.

X.143.5: On the basis of VII.67.5 Ge (fld. by Re) supplies *dhíyam* with the periphr. caus. *sātáye kṛtam*. The expression here would contrast with the one in 3ab; see above.

X.143.6: Though Ge follows Sāy. in supply "kings" as the referent of the simile *śamyū̆ iva*, I prefer the suggestion he floats in his n. 6ab, that it should rather be "parents" as in IV.41.7 *máṃhiṣṭhā pitáreva śambhū̆*.

X.144 Indra

A metrically varied hymn, which, *pace* the Anukr., mostly focuses on soma, not Indra. Indra's name appears only once in the hymn, a nom. in 6a, and he is otherwise represented by two occurrences of the oblique enclitic *te* (1a, 5a) (and possibly the voc. *sukrato* in 6c), about as uninsistent a presence as it is possible to have. The two occurrences of *índu-* 'drop' (1a, 6a) also evoke Indra phonologically but of course refer to soma. The presence of Indra only in the first and last verses elsewhere marks the hymn as a particular kind of ring composition, where the crucial term or concept is absent everywhere in the hymn but the beginning and end.

Some patterns: hemistich-init. *ayám* 1a, 2a, 2c, picked up by vs-init. *yám* 4a, 5a; pāda-init. *enā̆* 5c, d, *evā̆* 6a. Also, *viśvāyuḥ* 1c is answered by *ví tāry ā̆yu(ḥ)* in 5c, 6c.

Laura Massetti has compared the structure and themes in this hymn with Pindar's Nemean 3; see her *Phraseologie und Dichtersprache in der Sprache der griechischen Chorlyrik* (2019: 163–68) and *Pindar's* Pythian Twelve (2024: 14–15).

X.144.1–2: I take vs. 1 as implicitly subordinated to vs. 2ab, because of the *hí* (1a).

X.144.2: For ab Ge appositely cites as parallel IX.87.3 *ṛbhúr dhī́ra uśánā kā́vyena* "an insightful craftsman [/Ṛbhu], Uśanā by (his) poetic skill." This passage in fact helps solve an (unacknowledged) problem in our vs. The Pp. reads *kā́vyaḥ* here, thus a nom. sg. masc. adjectival form of initially accented *kā́vya-*, rendered by Ge as "dieser Seherische." The problem is that *kā́vya-* is otherwise only a neut. noun, "poetic skill/art"; the adjectival form is suffix-accented *kāvyá-*. Note that in IX.87.3 the root-accented neut. is in the instr. I suggest that here we should read loc. *kā́vye*, against the Pp., and, like the instr. in IX.87.3, it is specifying the realm in which the craftsman operates.

There are numerous, sometimes fanciful, interpr. of the bahuvrīhi *ūrdhvá-kṛśana-*, which also furnishes the Anukr. with an alternate name of the poet of the hymn. I am partial to my own: that the "pearls" are the bubbles on the surface of and above the exhilarating drink.

X.144.3–5: These vss. relate, in allusive fashion, the theft of soma from heaven by the falcon. The vss. are difficult to interpr. in places but contain striking images. Needless to say, in various places I go my own interpretational way.

X.144.3: The vs. depicts Soma amid the heavenly fortresses awaiting the falcon to carry him away and looking down from heaven towards earth, the goal of the journey.

The unidentified fem. pl. *āsú svā̀su* "among his own (females)" has no clear referent. The default is, as usual for fem. plurals, "cows," and this would make sense, given that Soma is called a *váṃsaga-* (on which word, see comm. ad X.102.7). But the scenario just sketched suggests another, narratively appropriate, interpr., already raised by Ge (n. 3b): "fortresses" (*pūrṣú*). The stem *púr-* is of course feminine, and in IV.27, with IV.26 the locus classicus for the RVic Somaraub myth, Soma announces in the first vs. that "a hundred metal fortresses guarded me" (*śatám mā púra ā́yasīḥ arakṣann*). Thus the image in b sets up a conceptual tension: Soma is depicted both as a virile bull situated in the middle of his cow-harem, as it were, but also as a helpless hostage surrounded by fortifications. These same fortresses are, in my view, also represented in the next vs., 4c, in the bahuvrīhi *śatá-cakram* 'hundred-wheeled'.

On *ahī-śū́-* see comm. ad VIII.32.2 and Scar 538–39. Contra the standard tr., who take the stem as the name of demon(s), I give it a full lexical tr. 'swelling like X'. (Scar splits the difference: the name of a demon, derived from a lexical reading.) The question is whether the first member is based on *áhi-* 'snake' with final lengthening or *ahī́-* 'fertile cow'. For the three passages in VIII (32.2, 26; 77.2) I favor the former; here I think both may be available. The question is – what is Soma looking down (*áva dīdhet*) upon? A possible answer immed. arises from the scenario sketched above: Soma is in heaven looking downward in hopes of spotting the falcon on its journey upward; what he will see is clouds – which can be imagined as "puffing up like snakes: (specifically cobras with their hoods) and/or "swelling like fertile cows" – either/both displaying the puffy curvy contours of clouds seen from above.

X.144.4: The final pāda (c) of this vs. is very difficult; in fact Ge does not tr. it after the first word. It is also metrically problematic: as transmitted it has 9 syllables. This could be raised to 12, with a fine Jagatī cadence by reading *ah^{í}yo avartaníḥ*, that is, restoring the *a-* elided by the Saṃhitā text and distracting the *-hy-* cluster of *'hyò* and assuming an initial **a-* on *vartaníḥ*,

elided without marking in the Saṃhitā text (a solution favored by Old). Whether these manipulations are worth it – esp. the last one – is unclear.

In any case I take acc. *śatácakram* as continuing the acc. phrase of ab, referring to Soma. As noted in the immed. preceding vs., I think "having a hundred wheels" is another reference to the fortresses surrounding Soma in heaven. Recall that acdg. to IV.27.1 there are a hundred metal fortresses guarding Soma. I take the 'wheels' as referring to the roughly circular shape of the fortifications.

The rest of c, *yò 'hyò vartaníḥ* I take as a nominal *izafe*-like cl., also referring to Soma. Whether to read *vartaníh* or **avartaníḥ* (see above) is hard to determine, because neither reading yields a lot of sense. The publ. tr. follows the Saṃhitā text. Cows regularly follow *vartaní-* (III.7.2, X.65.6, X.172.1, 4); identifying Soma as a *vartaní-* for a fertile cow might be an allusion to the mixing of milk with soma in the ritual, which is often depicted as cows racing to join the bull Soma. A negated **avartaníḥ*, though metrically better, is initially harder to interpr. Perhaps, with ref. to *ahīśvàḥ* in the previous vs., if that means "(clouds) swelling like fertile cows," it indicates that, while still confined in the 100 fortresses, Soma "had no track through the fertile cows [=clouds]" (with *ahyàḥ* acc. pl., not gen. sg.). I suggest this as an alt. tr., for which I now have a mild preference.

X.144.5: The first pāda contains the first reference to Indra since the first verse, once again in the oblique enclitic *te*. The pāda has thirteen syllables, instead of the expected twelve. An easy fix would be to delete the *te* (thus eliminating the item we're focusing on), a suggetion of Bartholomae's that Oldenberg rejects (1912: *Noten*, ad loc.). Arnold (1905: 324, metrical comm. ad loc.) suggests cutting up the hemistich differently -- ending pāda a with *padā̆* and starting the next pāda *ā̆ abharad*, as well as reading a distracted *śʲyenáś* in a. This suggestion is (rightly) viewed dubiously by both Oldenberg and van Nooten-Holland (1994: metrical comm. ad loc.); the latter point out that "the syntactic unity of the verse would be compromised" by such a reading.

On *ándhas-* as 'soma stalk' (not the "Saft" as Ge tr. here), see comm. ad IV.1.19. Here I take *ándhasaḥ* as a subjective gen.: "the stalk (*ándhas*) houses (the juice)," not "X houses the *ándhas*."

On the final pāda, see publ. intro.: I think the "family tie" is that between men and gods, kept in working order by the sacrifice.

X.144.6: Ge (n. 6ab) considers the *máhi tyájaḥ* as a reference to the enmity between the young Indra and the other gods at the time of the soma theft or the enmity with Tvaṣṭar because of Viśvarūpa, translating "So mag ... Indra diese grosse Feindschaft selbst under dem Göttern auf sich nehmen." But this doesn't make sense in an otherwise upbeat ending, and the backstory to enable such an allusion is nowhere to be seen. Moreover, *tyájas-* doesn't mean "Feindschaft," but "surrender, abandonment; legacy." I take it instead as one of the first instances of the later notion of sacrifice as *tyāga*, the "surrender" to the gods of men's offerings. The sentiment seems to follow directly on 5d, and point out that Indra is taking the oblation, which is the symbol for the family connection between gods and men, and fixing it up among the gods – for his sake as well, since *dhārayāte* is middle.

The publ. tr. of the 2nd hemistich misleadingly supplies more 2nd ps. reference than the text contains; there is only the voc. *sukrato*. I would now emend the tr. to "By will is vitality, is lifetime lengthened, o you of strong will; by will has this soma here been pressed from us."

Although the cooccurrence of *sukrato* and the two instr. *krátvā* certainly suggests that it's the addressee's *krátu-* that is bringing about these actions, the text itself keeps it at the level of suggestion.

I do not understand the abl. *asmát*, though perhaps it hints at the "surrender" just noted: the oblation produced by us is separated from us by Indra's appropriation of it.

X.145 Against co-wives

This hymn is found, more or less identically, in AVŚ III.18 and, in part but also much expanded, in AVP VII.12. See Griffiths's full treatment of the latter.

X.145.2: On *kuru* see comm. ad X.51.7.

X.145.4: Ge (flg. Sāy. and fld. by Don) takes the husband as the subj. of b and the co-wife the ref. of *asmín ... jáne*: "und nicht hängt er an dieser Person," for reasons that are not clear to me. Old is of my opinion, and see AVŚ III.18.3 *nó asmín ramase pátau* "you do not rest by this husband," addressed to the co-wife.

I do not know who the 1st pl. subj. of *gamayāmasi* is; it obviously includes the wife-speaker and possibly the plant, but in the next vs. (5c) the first dual is used for wife+plant: *sahāvahai*.

X.145.6: On *abhí √dhā* as 'harness', see *abhíhita-* V.50.4, X.85.11.

X.146 Lady of the Wilderness (Araṇyānī)

On the contents and tone of the hymn, see publ. intro. There are numerous tr. (inter alia, Macd (VRS and Hymns from the RV), Re (Hymnes spec.), Don, Mau, Th (Fs. Kuiper), van Buitenen (Intro. to transl. of MBh 3), Gerow (Lits. of India). I cannot engage with the details of them all.

The hymn contains a number of apparently pleonastic *iva*-s (1b, d, 2c, 3a, b, d), some of which show the apharesis found also in Middle Indic. The pluti in 1d is another sign of informal register.

X.146.1: On *grā́ma-* see comm. ad X.27.19. Certainly in this passage it is used as the complete opposite of the *áraṇya-* and whether it refers to a permanent settlement in the RV or (per Rau) not, the implication here is that it offers the safety and domestic stability of a village, in contrast to the wilderness.

X.146.2: The identities of the *vṛṣāravá-* and the *cicciká-*, beyond probably being animals that make noise, is up for grabs, and many possibilities have been floated. The point, however, is clear: the wilderness is full of alarming noises that serve as a sort of intimidating accompaniment to the progress of the Lady of the Wilderness herself.

X.146.3–4: These two central verses are somewhat responsive. The c pādas are very like: 3c *utó araṇyāníḥ sāyám* / 4c *vásann araṇyānyā́ṃ sāyám*, and both verses open with a domestic scene involving cows. Nonetheless, I do not think this rises to the level of an omphalos

X.146.3: I follow Th (who is fld by Don) in taking c as parenthetical. The speaker has reconfigured (or is trying to) the alarming noises and sights of vs. 2 to domestic ones, appropriate to the village. But in c the Araṇyānī still looms. The other course, taken by most tr., is to assume that the Araṇyānī herself "creaks like a cart," which I find unlikely.

X.146.4: The speaker's attempt to domestic the noises around him continues here, until the stark announcement "(something) has shrieked!"

X.146.5: Macd, Th, and Don take Araṇyānī as the subj. of cd. This is poss., but I find it psychologically more compelling to assume that the nervous speaker has finally made his peace with the wilderness and gives himself over to its pleasures.

X.146.6: A formal praśasti (*prá ... aśaṃsiṣam*) ends the hymn.

X.147–148

Although these two hymns to Indra are attributed to two different poets and are stylistically varied, they share some themes and some lexicon, in particular a fondness for the root √*kan* 'take pleasure': 147.3a, 4a; 148.1c, 3b, 4c.

X.147 Indra

X.147.1: I take bcd all as *yád* clauses detailing examples of Indra's effective *manyú-*. Ge parcels them out into a series of subord. and main clauses, but this seems inelegant.

We should expect **ápaḥ* in b, rather than *apáḥ*, which should be the acc. pl. of 'waters'; see the same problem in X.76.3 and the comm. thereon. In our passage the association of Vṛtra with (the release of) the waters might have led to a redactional misunderstanding and accent shift.

X.147.2: Ge (n. 2d) believes that *víśvāsu hávyāsv íṣṭiṣu* stands for *víśvāsu *hávyam íṣṭiṣu* and should be tr. "to be called upon at all sacrifices," with *hávya-* belonging to √*hū* 'call', not √*hu* 'pour, libate'. Although *hávya-* (so accented) does ordinarily mean 'to be called', as opposed to *havyá-* 'oblation', there are other exx. of *hávya-* that can or do belong to √*hu* and ambiguity is inherent in this stem. And in any case I believe we should tr. the text we have, not the one we wish we had. In fact, it seems quite likely that in this passage the poet is playing off less common homonyms of common lexical items. Our root-accented *íṣṭi-* belongs to √*yaj* 'sacrifice', but this form is quite rare (and may be found with suffix accent in II.1.9; see comm. there), esp. in contrast to *iṣṭí-* 'desire, quest', which is found in the immediately preceding pāda in the same pāda-final position in *gáviṣṭiṣu* 'quests for cattle'. The poet surely meant the contrast, esp. given a third rhyming pāda-final form in 3c *páriṣṭiṣu* 'in encirclements' (to a different lexeme, *pári* √*as*). In this playful context, *hávya-* to √*hu* rather than the usual √*hū* would simply add to the joke – amplified by calling Indra *puruhūta* 'much invoked' in the next pāda (3a).

X.147.4: I take this vs. as spelling out the reciprocal policy between Indra and mortals: a man who realizes that Indra has to be sacrificed to and, esp., provided with soma will acquire the bounty that Indra has to distribute (as described in 3b). The reciprocity is signaled lexically be the complementary forms *cākandhi* (subj. = Indra, 3a) and *cākanat* (subj. = mortal, 4a).

In b I see *mádam ... asya ráṃhyam* as a type of indirect discourse with *cíkatati* "will realize (that ...)," with the gerundive *ráṃhya-* predicated of *mádam* and *asya* referring to Indra: "his exhilaration is to be hastened" – i.e., soma should be offered forthwith. Ge's interpr. is quite diff.: "der sich auf seinen eiligen Rausch versteht." As far as I can tell, Ge thinks that *asya* refers to the mortal subject (though his tr. is ambig.), but in an Indra context the default would be Indra's *máda-*.

X.147.5: This vs. seems to situate Indra among other gods, mostly by indirection. In pāda a *śárdhāya* may refer to the "troop" of us mortals, esp. the patrons in vs. 3, but since *śárdha-* and *śárdhas-* often refer specifically to the Maruts, they would be available to the audience by association. Mitra and Varuṇa are present in c, though the former is also used as the common noun 'ally', and the latter is in a simile. In d *vibhaktā́* evokes Bhaga (see V.46.6).

I would substitute 'possessing uncanny power' for 'wily'.

X.148 Indra

Old sees a special relationship between this hymn and II.11, esp. the penchant for a trisyllabic reading of *índra-*. And vs. 2 contains two pādas (b, c) identical to II.11.4d, 5a.

X.148.1: The accent on *stumási* is surprising, since it appears to be a main clause verb. Old (ZDMG 60.726 [=KlSch. 201]) explains it by taking ab as the Grundlage of the *ā́ no bhara* clause in c, but this seems ad hoc. I think rather that the accent is indirectly generated by the two perfect participles, *suṣvāṇā́saḥ ... sasavā́ṃsaś ca*, which bracket the finite verb. The two participles depict two different occasions for praising Indra: at the sacrifice and after victory in a battle/contest. A fuller expression would be "After having pressed soma we praise you, and also after having won the prize, (we praise you)." Therefore *stumási* is effectively doubled and the accent is contrastive (with its gapped self).

The construction in c is more complex than it appears, at least in my view. In the rel. cl. *yásya* would seem to have a straightforward antecedent, *suvitám* – hence "bring us well-being in which you take pleasure" (so essentially Ge). But this is somewhat incoherent as a wish: why would Indra bring *us* something *he* particularly enjoys? It also doesn't conform with the usage of √*kan* in these two hymns. When Indra is subject of √*kan* (X.147.3, 148.4), what he takes pleasure in is mortal worshipers: e.g., 147.3 *aíṣu cākandhi ... sūríṣu* "take pleasure in these patrons" – though in both instances the complement is in the loc. I therefore think *yásya* must refer to a ritualist favored by Indra, one among our (*naḥ*) number. As for the gen., this may be a mixed construction: a gen. would work for the recipient of the main cl. ("bring X for him [gen.]") and has been carried over into the rel. cl., where a loc. would be better.

X.148.2: As noted above, bc = II.11.4d, 5a. The pāda II.11.5a refers to Vṛtra, as is clear from the rest of the vs. But most tr. (see Bl's [RR] comments ad II.11.4–5 in addition to Ge, JSK [DGRV II.189]) take our c pāda with d and assume that "the one placed in hiding" is soma. (The pāda is also found in III.39.6, with unclear referent – maybe sun/light; see comm. ad loc.) In contrast I link pāda c with b, not d, which allows the acc. phrase in c to be a second obj. of *sahyāḥ* (though I supply a past indicative form of √*sah* for c), with the referent Vṛtra as in II.11.5. Bl splits the difference: he takes c with d, but considers it a ref. to Vṛtra (or a demon) – tr. "we hold (the demon) who is hidden in the waters like soma in a prasrávaṇa (pitcher?)." This doesn't have much to recommend it. It is also possible that c has double reference – both looking backwards

to b, with Vṛtra as reference, and forwards to d, with soma as referent. The soma "hidden in water" would then be the soma plant as it is swelled with water before pressing. There are also a couple of other possibilities for c. It could be a reference to the well-known myth (see esp. X.51–53) in which Agni runs away from his ritual duties and hides in the waters, before being found by the gods. If Agni is the referent, "we" would be bringing the two crucial requisites for the sacrifice: fire and soma. It is also worth considering X.72.7 *átrā samudrá ā́ gūḍhám, ā́ sū́ryam ajabhartana* "then you brought here the sun, which was hidden in the sea," where it's the sun, hidden in a type of water, that is brought – although I find it hard to fit the sun into our context. If either of the last two alternates is selected, the tr. of *bibhṛmási* should be changed from 'offer' to 'bring/bear'.

X.148.3: The syntax of this vs. is a little loose – beginning with the *vā*, which is not in a clear disjunctive structure. JSK (DGRV II.188–89) suggests apropos 2–3ab that *vā* "conjoins nearly parallel interstanzaic modal clauses interrupted by an intervening indicative clause." The "nearly parallel ... modal[s]" are 2b opt. *sahyāḥ* and 3a impv. *arca*, which don't seem all that parallel to me; the intervening indicative clause is 2cd. I think rather that the disjunction signaled by *vā* is conceptual: the difference between Indra as martial hero (vs. 2), as esp. exemplified by the Vṛtra battle (2c by my interpr.), and Indra as the priestly hero of the Vala myth (3ab). This conceptual division corresponds to the one in 1ab, between the ritual and martial circumstances for praising Indra.

The *aryáḥ* opening pāda a is most likely a gen. dependent on *gíraḥ*; cf. I.112.14 *aryó gíraḥ*. The question is the identity of the *arí-*. Ge (n. 3a) suggests Pṛthī (see 5a), the Opferherr, who would be a subjective gen. (i.e., he is the singer); Th (Fremdl. 31; see also HPS B+I 155) suggests (rather hazily) that it's Indra himself, or perhaps rather, whatever (divine) stranger is being invited to the ritual: an objective gen. (someone sings to him). Although this non-reflexive doubling of referents in a single clause seems, at best, tricky, the fact that Indra serves as priest and leader of the Aṅgirases in ab (so explicitly Th) as well as recipient of offerings in d makes this trick at least thinkable.

In b it is unclear what *ṛ́ṣīṇām* should be construed with. I take it with *víprаḥ* as a variant of the "king of kings" construction; most take it with *sumatím* "the good thinking of the seers." This is perfectly possible, and not much rides on it.

The gist of the second hemistich is that we hope to be the ultimate beneficiaries of our offerings to Indra; that is, we hope and expect compensation from him as reciprocity for our ritual service – it is in this way that we derive (indirect) pleasure from the soma drinks. The *áya-* formation *raṇáyanta* is intransitive (or in my old terms "I/T") with the meaning "find pleasure" in most of its occurrences; a transitive (/double I/T") *raṇáyati* is found in only two places in the RV, under special circumstances (see my *-áya-* monograph, pp. 75, 143). Ge (with Sāy.) wants it to be transitive here, meaning "cause (you) to enjoy," but frets about the medial form (n. 3c). This is the wrong thing to worry about: it's simply an *-anta* replacement of my usual type. The real reason that it isn't transitive is that that stem is usually not. But the poet may have enjoyed hinting at a transitive formation on the basis of the *-áya-* (*"please [you] with soma drinks"), but opting for a somewhat paradoxical "be pleased by soma drinks (offered to you)."

What puzzles me is the *enā́*; it would have been easy enough to conjoin *sómaiḥ* and *bhakṣaíḥ* with *utá*. I assume *enā́* is summarizing the whole rest of the ritual hoopla, including the soma drinks.

In the publ. tr. the voc. *ratholha* is not tr. as a voc., since "o chariot-conveyed one" sounded impossibly stilted.

X.148.4: In pāda a *imā̆ bráhmā ... śaṃsi* is one of the relatively rare exx. in the RV of the inherited syntagm of a neut. pl. as subj. of a sg. verb – here a bit complicated by the fact that the verb itself is a pass. aor. (This morphological analysis, with Sāy. and Ge [n. 4a], is more appealing than 1st sg. mid., with Gr, though the latter is not unthinkable.)

X.149 Savitar

X.149.1: Old points out the sequence of cosmic spaces: *pṛthivī̆m* (a), *dyā̆m* (b), *antárikṣam* (c), *samudrám*.

There are several different ways to interpr. the second hemistich. In c the question is what is the shared element between the frame and the simile. I take it to be the verb: "milked the midspace like a (male) horse." This is of course absurd on the surface, but would conform to the kind of gender-bending paradox that is often found in RVic cosmic discourse. Ge, who considers the possibility of this interpr. in n. 1c, suggests that it refers to a horse urinating. A less striking interpr, which goes back to Sāy. and is represented in Ge's and Re's tr., takes *dhúnim* as the shared quality: "... the midspace boisterous like a horse." This is certainly possible, but I prefer the more conceptually challenging interpr. In either case, the question is what is "boisterous" about the midspace? I assume it is that it is the domain of winds, storms, and the like.

Re (flg. Lü 124) further considers *adhukṣat* to have a double acc., with the 2nd obj. *samudrám* in d: "milked the midspace for the sea" / "milked the sea out of the midspace," though he himself thinks that √*duh* with double acc. is generally middle. Ge seems to take *samudrám* as an appositive to *antárikṣam*. I take *antárikṣam* and *samudrám* as separate objects of *adhukṣat*, one corresponding to the animal being milked, the other to the substance yielded. This is akin to the Lü/Re double acc. interpr., but does not require them to be in a single larger syntagm or for the *samudram* to be a byproduct of the midspace.

X.149.2: From the sea milked out in 1d the rest of the cosmos arises. This cosmogony flatly contradicts the one in 1ab, where the various parts of the cosmos exist already independently and are set in their places by Savitar. This kind of contradiction is common in RVic cosmology, which does not attempt to present a self-consistent image, but tries on a series of "what if?s."

Pāda c contains one of the rare exx. of the unextended 3rd sg. impf. of √*as*, namely *ās*. On the artificiality of this archaic-looking form, see comm. ad X.85.6–12. Here it forms a phrasal verb with the ppl. *útthitam*.

X.149.3: The cosmogony gets even murkier here, and interpr. diverge. Ge and Re seems to take *idám* and *anyád* as coreferential, but since the rest of the hemistich seems to define the *anyád* ('other') as the heavenly/godly world, the near-deictic *idám* would be out of place. I think the two are contrastive, and – somewhat paradoxically – the point is that this earth was created before the heavenly world.

I would prefer to render *ánu dhárma* "according to his ordinance / principles," but the phrase *dhartā̆ diváḥ* in the next vs. (4d) constrained me. Still, I think the point is that the sun was born acdg. to Savitar's overall plan, and so I would favor one of the alternative tr. just given.

X.149.4: Ge pulls *sumánā(ḥ)* out of the simile to modify Savitar ("freundlich wie die ... (Kuh)"). Since the form is ambig. between masc. and fem. nom. sg., this is possible, but it breaks up the sequence of similes in series.

X.149.5: The Anukr. clearly interpr. *árcan* in c as a PN and attributed the hymn to Arcant Hairaṇyastūpa. Ge takes it both as a PN and as the pres. part. it appears to be (see n. 5c), but this seems unnec., esp. given the attestation of verbal forms to this pres. stem in this stratum of hymns (X.147.3, 148.3).

X.150 Agni

For the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. As noted there, the final pāda of each vs. begins with a form of *mṛḷīká-*; in vss. 1–3 and 5 it's the dat. *mṛḷīkā́ya*, but in 4 the acc. *mṛḷīkám*. The refrain in vs. 4 also deviates from the other vss. in another way: 1–3, 5 repeat the last four syllables of pāda c after *mṛḷīkā́ya*, but vs. 4, which needs five syllables after *mṛḷīkám*, innovates with the dat. *dhánasātaye*, based on, but not identical to, *dhánasātau* in the middle of c.

X.150.1: On the accentuation in the voc. phrase, see comm. ad X.118.5.

X.150.2: On the interpr. of the first hemistich, see comm. ad I.91.10, which contains the identical hemistich. An alt. tr. with both acc. phrases construed with the part. *jujuṣāṇáḥ*, is also possible.

X.150.4: Pāda a has two extra syllables; III.2.8d is identical save for lacking *devó*, so it is tempting to delete it. Old gives his cautious imprimatur, so also Arnold.

X.150.4–5: On the use of *puróhita-* here, see publ. intro.

X.151 Śraddhā

X.151.3: That the gods make themselves trusted / trustworthy among *ásureṣu ... ugréṣu* "powerful lords/Asuras" shows that even at this very late stage of the RV *ásura-* does not (have to) have a negative sense and designate the eternal enemies of the Devas. Here the "powerful lords" are the equivalent for the gods of "benefactors who offer sacrifice" (*bhojéṣu yájvasu*, 2c, 3c) for men – in other words, positively viewed authority figures.

X.151.4: It is notable that the gods are depicted as performing sacrifice, as in the more famous passages X.90.16 and X.124.6.

X.152 Indra

Found also in AVŚ I.20.4, I.21; AVP II.88.

X.152.2: Starting with Sāy., *vimṛdháḥ* has regularly been interpr. as the nom. sg. of a them. bahuvrīhi *vimṛdhá-* meaning 'die Verächter abwehrend'; so Old, Ge (n. 2b), AiG II.1.281, Scar 212 n. 289, as well as the tr. of the AV repetitions of this vs., Wh (AVŚ I.21.1) and Zehnder (AVP II.88.4). The only significant holdout being Gr, who takes it as a gen. to a hapax root noun cmpd *vimṕdh-*, "mit unregelmässiger Fortrückung des Tons." I am quite dubious about the dominant interpr. for several reasons. For one thing, the importation of the verbal notion

“abwehrend" seems unjustified, borrowed from the formulae (to be disc. below) in which the root noun *mṕdh-* participates; only Zehnder’s “der keine Beleidiger hat” confines itself to the elements actually found in the cmpd. Scar justifies the addition of the verbal notion by explaining *vimṛdhá-* as “Hypostase aus *ví mṕdhas* + √*HAN-*, √*NOD*, etc.,” but this is simply a description of the interpretational process. I instead think it must have been generated from the formulaic phrases found in this very hymn, involving *mṕdh- ví* √*han*, occurring twice in tmesis: *ví mṕdho jahi* “smash away the scornful” (3a, 4a; see also VI.53.4, VIII.61.13). Here, given the rt noun cmpd *vṛtra-hán-* immediately preceding, I think we can “borrow” that *-hán-*. Since a cmpd **vi-mṛdh(o)-hán* or **mṛdh(o)-vi-hán-* is impossible, the *hán-* was gapped, and the gen. sg. *mṕdhaḥ* depends upon this gapped head. I do recognize the accentual problem (the sticking point for both Wh and Old), but consider it less serious than the creation of a thematic stem of dubious meaning. In any case I think the poet is playing with formulaics throughout this hymn, esp. involving *ví*. See comm. on 3b..

X.152.3: Since *rákṣaḥ* is entirely parallel to *mṕdhaḥ* in the syntagm in pāda a, and *rákṣaḥ* must be a neut. sg. *-as-* stem, we might expect *mṕdhaḥ* to have the same grammatical identity – and indeed an *s*-stem *mṛḍhas-* does exist, albeit marginally. However, Gr and Ge take *mṕdhaḥ* here as acc. pl. The repetition of the formula in 4a is followed by a cl. with a parallel acc. pl. *pṛtanyatáḥ*, which would favor the interpr. of *mṕdhaḥ* there as the acc. pl. of the root noun *mṕdh-*. So the evidence pulls both ways, but given the marginality of the *-as*-stem, best perhaps to interpr. both as belonging to the root noun.

Note the clever misdirection in b: *ví vṛtrásya hán(ū)*. Though *hánū* is of course a noun, “(two) jaws,” and the obj. of *ví ... ruja*, the presence of *vṛtrahā́* in 2b and *ví ... vṛtrahan* in the next pāda (3c) invite the audience to assume another instance of *vṛtrahán-*.

X.153 Indra

X.153.1: The identity of these tender female attendants on the new-born Indra is not clear, but perhaps their exact identity is less important than their maternal solicitude.

The med. pf. to √*bhaj* means ‘receive as share’ (see Kü 334–35). Again, I am not sure why they receive this share of good heroism.

X.153.5: The 2nd ps. ref. of *sá* here does not conform to its ordinary usage (as disc. in my “Sa figé” art.); we should expect an impv. here. But I assume in this late hymn the rules for this distribution are breaking down.

X.154: The dead

X.154.1: As pointed out by Ge (n. 1) inter alia, the various foodstuffs are appropriate to gods and pitars in the afterlife. It is to them that the dead man should go in d. The use of the “future imperative” *gachatāt* is a little surprising, since what prior action it should follow isn’t specified. It could possibly refer to the various present tense verbs in abc, but, more likely in my view, it presupposes the subject’s death before his journey to the afterlife.

X.155 Against a witch

On the contents of the hymn see publ. intro. As noted there, the Sadānvās are quite prominent in the AV.

X.155.2: *Pace* Gr, *cattó* represents *cattā́* + *u*.

X.155.4: The verb *ájaganta* appears to be a plupf. to √*gam* and is so taken by the standard tr. (as also Kü 159). However, it doesn't make a lot of sense in context ("when you went at/to the breast ..."). I suggest emending the form to **ajaghanta*, a plupf. to √*han*. The witches are beating their breasts in mourning at the slaying of Indra's enemies (=their friends and allies). Although I strongly resist emending the RVic text, in this Atharvan hymn with numerous unusual forms, I have fewer scruples.

On *dhāṇikī-* as a term for female genitalia, see already Edgerton, *-ka*-suffixes, 56, citing also TS VII.4.19.3, AV XX.136.3 = RVKh V.22.8. He derives it from *dhā́na-* 'receptacle'. Sim. EWA s.v. *dhā́nikā-*. See also EWA s.v. *maṇḍūra-*, where it is suggested that the "rust" is menstrual blood.

On *-yāśu-* see comm. ad I.126.6. On *budbudá-*, with its unusual phonology (plain *b*) and morphology (exact redupl.), see EWA s.v. *budbudá-yāśu-*

X.155.5: On the leading around of the cow, see X.165.5.

X.156 Agni

X.156.2: *sénā-* could alternatively be 'army', as Ge and Re take it, but 'weapon' works just as well. Both senses seem to be necessary in the RV and are often difficult to distinguish, though the cmpd *sena-nī́-* must contain 'army'.

X.156.3: On the SV reading *pavím* 'wheelrim' for *paṇím*, see Old and Ge (n. 3c). Neither seems to produce the *best* argument for retaining the RV form – that it is semantically the more difficult – and more interesting – reading, while the SV form is a trivial correction.

X.156.4: Making the sun mount in heaven is ordinarily Indra's deed.

X.156.5: Gonda (Vedic Lit. 225) points out the rhyming splvs. *préṣṭhaḥ śréṣṭhaḥ*, which in this late hymn are undistracted.

X.157 All Gods

As indicated in the publ. intro., vss. 4–5 in this hymn have one of the few depictions of the Asuras as a corporate group, counterpoised against the Devas (see also X.53.4). See also X.124 and my 2016 "The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas" (Ged. F. Staal: *On Meaning and Mantras: Essays in Honor of Frits Staal*, ed. George Thompson and Richard Payne, 289–306).

X.157.4: Ge takes all of vs. 4 as a subord. cl.: "when the gods had smashed the Asuras and ...," but this requires him to take *ā́yan* as an auxiliary in periphrastic construction with the gerund *hatvā́ya* ("geschlagen hatten"; see n. 4a). But this would be an unprecedented periphrasis at this period, as far as I know, and the *yád* subordinator would be too deep in the cl. I take pāda a as a

somewhat abortive sentence, with *hatvā́ya devā́ḥ ásurān* as the beginning of a main cl., and *yád ā́yan* a subord. cl. having the Asuras as subject. The sentence then begins again in the next pāda, repeating the subj. *devā́ḥ*, with the main cl. flg. in 5.

X.158 Sūrya

X.158.1: As indicated in the publ. intro., the ablatives in this vs. are conceptually ambig.: do they name the places from which the god exercises his protective function or the inimical forces from which the god is asked to protect us? Opinions differ; see Ge n. 1. Ge opts for the latter interpr., Re for the former. Pāda c of the next vs. (2) favors the Ge solution, but I am still uncertain.

X.158.2: This vs. is a metrical mess.

The morphological identity of *jóṣā* (Pp. *jóṣa*) is disputed. Most (Gr, Ge, Old, Re, Lub, Baums) take it as a 2nd sg. impv., but it would have to be derived from a full-grade thematic stem with root accent, which does not exist. Lub tries to deal with this problem by pronouncing it an imperative to a subjunctive stem, which seems to me a bit of a morphological monstrosity. I prefer to take it as a 1st sg. subjunctive; this does not have to belong to a root aor. as Wh (Rts) takes it – though it could. It might simply be the subj. to the extremely well-attested thematic stem *juṣá-*, with the full grade characteristic of the subj.; in the 1st sg. the expected them. vowel + subj. marker ➔ *-ā-* would be neutralized. However, a major problem is the root accent, and so perhaps Wh's root aor. subj. interpr. is better, esp. since it can also account for the 3rd ps. *jóṣat(i)* (see comm. ad X.105.8). Old's objection to a 1st sg. interpr. is the impv. *pāhí* in c, which he thinks should be parallel. But mixing 1st and 2nd ps. in a RVic vs. is hardly unprecedented.

By my interpr. the main cl., consisting only of *jóṣā* (plus the voc.) lacks an antecedent to the rel. phrase *yásya te*; the *te* has been, as it were, demoted to the subord. cl. Those who interpr *jóṣā* as an impv. take it in absol. usage ("enjoy!"), with the rel. cl. dependent on the voc. ("o Savitar, whose ...)

On *háras-* see comm. ad X.16.7.

I see a pun in *savā́n* in b. When this stem appears with a numeral (as here), it refers to soma-pressings. See, e.g., IV.26.7 ... *abharat sómaṃ, sahásraṃ savā́ṁ ayútaṃ ca sākám* "(the falcon) brought the soma, a thousand pressings and ten thousand all at once." But in a Savitar context (as here) it generally belongs to the stem cognate with that god, meaning 'impulsion, stimulus'.

X.158.3: I don't understand what the mountain is doing here. Ge (n. 3ab) adduces several passages containing both Savitar and Parvata, but they're just that -- passages with both, but no obvious reason why.

X.158.5: I take *nṛcákṣasaḥ* as a pun, with two essentially opposite meanings: 1) "having the eyes of men," that is, merely human, not divine, sight; 2) "having 'the eye of men' [=sun]," which enables sight.

X.159 Against Cowives

On the style of this hymn, see publ. intro. The hymn is dense with 1st sg. pronouns and presents itself as an *ātmastuti* cum victory paean.

X.159.1: In addition to the striking 1st ps. pronominal adj. *māmaká-*, whose low register status is mentioned in the publ. intro., the *l*-suffixed form *vid-valá-* also gives the impression of the demotic, against the usual *r*-form of the suffix (*-vara-*); see AiG II.2.906–9 on these suffixes. There are very few *-vala-* stems.

X.159.5: On cd see Narten, MSS 14: 43 [=KlSch 5–6], with disc. of previous lit. The root affiliation of the verb *ā́vṛkṣam* has been much disputed, with √*vraśc,* √*vṛj*, and √*vṛh* to choose among (see Old, Ge n. 5cd). Narten makes a good case for √*vṛh* 'tear, rip' on syntactic grounds.

On the negated primary comp. *ástheyas-* see AiG II.2.450, Ge's n. 5cd, and Narten's disc. Its positive is *sthirá-* 'steadfast'

X.159.6: Note the phonological figure ***vīrá**sya **virā́**jani*.

X.160 Indra

X.160.4: The vs. begins and ends with lexemes with the preverb *ánu* (a: *ánu* √*(s)paś*, d *ánu* √*diś*).

The sense of the idiom in c, *aratnaú níḥ* √*dhā* "hold/put out/off at/on/by the elbow" can only be guessed at, though it's clear that it's a hostile act. See Old and Ge (n. 4c). Ge suggests it's a boxer's trick; the publ. tr. substitutes the Engl. idiom "at arm's length" (i.e., keeps him at a distance), though I'm not sure what role the elbow would play.

The sense of *ánānudiṣṭa-* isn't clear. There are no other exx. of *ánu* √*diś* in the RV, but the lexeme is fairly common in Saṃhitā prose, meaning 'point out, specify'. Gr and Ge take it as 'unaufgefordert' (unsolicited, unasked), presumably from 'unpointed-out / unappointed'(?). My 'unprecedented' is based on the later use of *anudeśa* in the sense of a rule referring back to another rule. but perhaps the Gr/Ge route is preferable.

X.160.5: On the last two words, *śunáṃ huvema* and their connection to the earlier Viśvāmitra oeuvre, see publ. intro.

X.161 Contra disease

X.161.1: I failed to render the *utá*; the tr. should read "and from the kingly disease."

Also, in c "truly" should be deleted.

X.161.2: Pāda b might read more elegantly as "if he has gone down to the very face of death."

X.161.3: I don't know what the oblation is doing "with a thousand eyes," esp. when the parallel adjectives refer to time periods. But I see no reason to emend or re-semanticize it.

X.162 Contra miscarriage

X.162.1: The morphological identity of *ámīvā* here and in 2a is disputed. Ge and Old consider it an instr. to the fem. *ámīvā-*, but I wonder whether such an under-marked instr. would be freely formed at this late date. I prefer to take it as a nom. sg., but this does cause problems with the masc. rel. *yáḥ*. Re suggests that a *-van*-stem *ámīvan-* was secondarily formed after the cmpds

amīva-cā́tana-/-hán-. My solution would be similar, but simpler: because there are masc. stems ending in *-ā*, the gender clash was not overly worrisome to the poet; I don't think we need to manufacture an intermediate masc. *-an*-stem. Or, with Ge's alternative adapted from Sāy. (n. 1c), it's possible that the fem. stem was appositional to *yáh ... durṇā́mā*, "als Krankheit."

X.162.3: On this vs. as depicting successive stages of pregnancy, see Ge (n. 3ab) and the publ. intro.

X.162.5–6: The lexeme *ní √pad* here seems to have a sexual sense, like *ní √gam* in X.10.12 (q.v.).

X.163 Contra disease

X.163.5: Flg. a very tentative alternative suggestion of Old's that *vanam* might be derived from *√van* 'love', I take *vanaṃkáraṇa-* as 'love-maker', a euphemistic designatiom of the penis. Alternatively, if *vanam* belongs with *vána-* 'wood', it could mean 'wood-maker' and refer specifically to the erect penis; cf. American slang "woody" for an erection. The problem with either of these interpr. is that the penis would be referred to twice, by adjacent words, contrary to the practice of the rest of the hymn. But perhaps the fact that both words are euphemistic substitutes and also designate different functions of the same body part would allow this duplication. The other body parts here, hair and nails, do not form a natural class with what precedes, so they are of no help.

X.164 Contra bad thought

For the unifying theme of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.164.3: The three instr. in pāda a, *āsásā, niḥśásā*, and *abhiśásā* are unified by their derivation from the root *√śaṃs* 'pronounce, proclaim' plus a directional preverb, but they also all have developed idiomatic meanings. Both the first and last of these lexemes are reasonably well attested: *āśás-* generally means 'hope, wish', presumably via a more literal 'bring/attract by proclaiming' (like *ā́ √kṛ*, *ā́ √pū*, *ā́ √yaj* 'bring/attract, ... by purification, ... by sacrifice'). *ábhi √śaṃs-* means 'curse' or 'calumny', via 'pronounce against'; though *abhiśás-* is found only here, the *-ti*-stem abstract *abhíśasti-* is well represented. The middle term, however, is very limited. The root-noun cmpd is found only here, and the only other RVic occurrence of this lexeme is *ániḥśasta-* in IV.34.11, whose meaning is underdetermined. The literal sense of the lexeme must be 'proclaim away/out' and because of the oppositional preverbs *ā́* '(towards) here' ... *níḥ* 'away, out', it should be the opposite of *āśás-*, perhaps 'ban, banishment' (see *níṣkṛtim* 'explusion' in the next hymn, X.165.1) – but this doesn't work well in the passage. Although 'blame' is not a true antonym for 'wish, hope', it fits better in the trio – and the result of "proclaiming out' may be 'blame'. On all three words, see Scar 528–30.

The position of *ápa* is unusual for a preverb in tmesis.

X.165 All Gods (Bird of Ill Omen)

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is devoted to averting the potential danger produced by the arrival of a dove. Despite Western associations of the dove with peace and love,

it has negative associations in Vedic. The gṛhya sūtras consider a dove coming into the house a bad omen; see, e.g., ŚGS V.5.1, ĀśvGS III.7.7, etc., which prescribe the recitation of this hymn.

X.165.1: Ge (also Wh AVŚ VI.27.1) takes *yád* as goal of *ichán*; the *tásmai* in c should then pick up *yád*: "what(ever) the dove is seeking, to that we will chant." But this seems unduly restrictive. I think *ichán* in absolute usage is more sinister: we don't know what the dove is after, but it's surely nothing good. And *tásmai* ought to refer to the dove, at least in my opinion.

X.165.2: The imperatival *hí* clause in c gives the grounds for the further imperative in d, as often. In other words, because we hope/expect that Agni will enjoy our oblation, we hope/expect that he will arrange for the bird to avoid us.

X.165.3: The fem. loc. *āṣṭryā̆m* is difficult and its interpr. depends entirely on context. Because of the parallel loc. *agnidhā̆ne* it's generally rendered as 'fireplace, hearth, stove' vel sim. (Gr, Wh AVŚ VI.27.3, EWA s.v.), with a bit of a twist in Ge's 'kitchen' (Küche). Re suggests the more general 'maison' on the basis of *gṛhéṣu* in 2b. My longshot 'corner' presupposes a connection with *áśri-* (fem.) 'corner, edge' (RV *cátur-aśri-* 2x). Its form here would represent either a morphological regularization (substituting a well-known suffix *-trī-* for the rare *-ri-*) or a blend with *áṣṭrā-* 'goad' (I'd favor the former).

X.165.5: The leading around of the cow in b is reminiscent of a similar ritual act in X.155.5, as Ge points out. Effacing all difficulties in c is like the effacing of the traces/footprints of death on returning from the funeral, using the same verb. See X.18.2 *mṛtyóḥ padáṃ yopáyanto yád aíta* "Effacing the footprint of death when you have gone." Here it must refer to the footprints the dove has left in the house (see 3b, 4b).

X.166 Against rivals

The aggressively triumphant tone of this hymn is reminiscent of X.159, the first-person victory paean of a wife having conquered her rival wives (*sapátnī-*), as here the first-person speaker proclaims his triumph over his *sapátna-* (1b, 2a, c). This masc. stem is, of course, a backformation from the fem. *sapátnī-*; see EWA s.v. *pátnī-*, and this hymn may be modeled on the cowife hymn just cited.

X.166.1: The Engl. tr. obscures the difference between the two words for 'rival': *sapátna-* (b) and *śátru-* (c). Given the derivation of the former (see just above), it may refer to a more intimate rival than the *śátru-*.

X.166.4: *viśvákarmeṇa* in b is the only thematic form to what is usually an *n*-stem *viśvákarman-*. This thematic stem may have been extracted from a compound like **viśvakarma-dhāman-*, as suggested by Ge (n. 4b), or it may simply be that at this late stage thematization is in the air. See comm. ad X.130.1. Note, however, that the correct *n*-stem instr. sg. *viśvákarmaṇā* is found nearby in X.170.4. It's also striking in this passage that the thematized instr. is followed immed. by another instr. to a *-man-* stem, *dhā̆mnā*, which must be read as trisyllabic *dhā̆m^{a}nā*, which is in apposition to *viśvákarmeṇa*. Perhaps the fact that Viśvakarma(n) is conceptually animate, whereas *dhā̆man-* is a clear neuter, played a role.

On the arguably trifunctional array in cd, see publ. intro.

X.166.5: JL points out the nice phonetic figure of *maṇḍū́kā (...) udakā́n*.

X.167 Indra

pári seems to be the Lieblingswort in the first few vss.: 1a, 1d, 2a.

In the last sentence of the intro., subst. vs. 3 for vs. 4.

X.167.1: I take *sutásya* as dependent on *kaláśasya*, not coreferent with it like Ge.

puruvī́ra- is a standard epithet of *rayí-*; see comm. ad VI.32.4. In most of these occurrences the adj. is masc., but here it is fem. Although it is generally said that *rayí-* can be either masc. or fem., in fact most of the supposed fem. occurrences can be otherwise explained (see comm. ad VI.8.5). However, the fem. occurrences cannot be reduced to zero, and this is one of the stubborn ones. Old thinks the fem. *puruvī́rām* here is metrically conditioned.

X.167.3: As Ge points out (n. 3a), *rā́jñaḥ* belongs with both Soma and Varuṇa and is positioned between them.

X.167.4: With Ge (n. 3d) I think *bhakṣam akaram* ("I did consuming") is an analytic version of *abhakṣayam* ("I consumed," 3d). The reason is obvious: Indra wants to use an aorist and the secondary root √*bhakṣ* does not have one.

In this vs. Indra explicitly recognizes the reciprocal bargain of the sacrifice: he gets the soma and the praise hymn *if* he arrives with something to give.

X.168 Vāyu

This hymn has attracted numerous tr., which is somewhat surprising for a fairly inconsequential – if pleasingly constructed – hymn. In addition to Ge and Re (EVP XV), see Macd. (VRS), Th (Gedichte), Don.

As noted in the publ. intro. (in addition to most of those just cited), although the Anukr. names Vāyu as the deity of the hymn, he doesn't appear in it – only his less divinized, more physical alloform Vāta. It's worth noting that *vā́ta-* is also found in the next two hymns: X.169.1 and, in the cmpd. *vā́tajūta-*, X.170.1.

X.168.1: The first pāda consists merely of an acc. NP, but, as noted in the publ. intro., the template GEN [god's name] *nú* ACC [greatness/deeds, etc.] reminds us of openings like the famous beginning of I.32: *índrasya nú vīryā́ṇi prá vocam*, and I (like Ge, Macd, Re, Th, but not Don) supply "I proclaim."

Various suggestions have been offered for the real-world equivalent of the "making (things) red" phrase; consult the tr. referenced above. In addition to those, I wonder if it describes the dawn, a frequent referent of *aruṇá-*, as Re points out. Although only *vā́ta-* appears in this hymn, the Anukr. considers Vāyu, the wind god, to be the dedicand, and Vāyu of course is the first recipient of soma at the dawn sacrifice.

X.168.2: Again, there is a wide range of views on the meaning and referents of *viṣṭā́ḥ*, for which consult the other tr. The lexeme *ví* √*sthā* generally means 'spread out, be dispersed'; here I think it refers to the eddies and countergusts that are part of a strong wind – in my experience,

such a wind does not seem to be a single unified movement of air, but varies in speed and direction and therefore seems to consists of numerous parts.

X.168.3: "Companion of the waters" – presumably, as Th suggests, because wind often accompanies rain. But as he also suggests, perhaps because a strong wind sets bodies of water in motion, raising ripples and then waves, thus appearing to play with them.

X.168.4: The expression "his sounds are heard, not his form" is an obvious zeugma. Most tr. add "is not seen" to accommodate the "form," but the Skt. does not – and I think the expression is more striking in its truncated form.

X.169 Cows

The Anukr. ascribes this hymn to a descendent of Kakṣīvant (Śabara Kākṣīvata), but it lacks the flair of this eponymous ancestor.

X.169.1: *jīvádhanya-* elsewhere explicitly modifies waters (e.g., I.80.4).

X.169.2: On the use of the names of the cows in ritual, see Old and V.3.3, adduced by Ge.

The mention of the Aṅgirases of course refers to the Vala myth.

X.170 Sūrya

Gonda (Ved.Lit. 212) considers this hymn to be banal, mediocre, and devoid of deeper meaning; it hardly seems fair to single out this brief hymn for such scorn, esp. because in fact it has some nice rhetorical flourishes and some tricky gender switches.

Forms of *(ví)* √*bhrāj* 'blaze (forth)' open hemistichs in all four vss.: 1a / 2a *vibhrā́ḍ bṛhát*, 3c *viśvabhrā́ḍ bhrājáḥ*, 4a *vibhrā́jan*.

X.170.1: The gender of the subj. changes from neut. in ab (on the basis of *bṛhát* and part. *dádhat*) to masc. in cd (on the basis of *vā́tojūto yáḥ*), with the masc. rel. technically not in gender agreement with its antecedent. Old gets rather exercised by this, but it seems simple enough to supply the neut. subj. 'light' (*jyótis-* found in 2d, 3a, 4a) in the first half-vs. and allow the rel. to agree in sense if not in gender. See Ge (n. 1a) and Re. By contrast Scar. prefers to supply "Wesen" = Sūrya, but the insistent presence of *jyótis-* in the other vss. of the hymn favors the former solution.

I don't know why the sunlight should "drink the somyan honey," but I suspect that the phrase here refers to water, perhaps "drunk" by evaporation. Alternatively, and in fact simultaneously, like the other gods at the ritual, principally Indra, Sūrya should partake of the soma at the soma sacrifice and offer good things to the sacrificer in return, as pāda b indicates.

The final phrase of the vs., *ví rājati*, nicely echoes initial *vibhrā́j-*.

X.170.2: The gender of the subj. remains neut. throughout this vs., though the beginning of the 2nd hemistich flirts with a switch to masc., like 1c: *amitrahā́ vṛtrahā́* appear to be masc., and usually are. However, with AiG III.239 I take *-hā́* as serving for the neut. as well (though see comm. ad VI.48.21). If this is considered morphological apostasy, the cmpds can be taken as secondary predications: "<u>As</u> a smasher of foes, <u>as</u> a smasher of obstacles, the best smasher of

Dasyus ...” (likewise the two *-hā́* cmpds at the end of d). Neut. *dasyuhántamam* puts a stop to this flirtation.

The phonetic figure of 1a *vibhrā́ḍ bṛhát* is amplified in 2a with a third term, *súbhṛtam.*

X.170.3: The pattern of vs. 1, with neut. in ab and masc. in cd, returns here. This time the gender flirtation in c is in the opposite direction: since *-bhrā́ṭ* in 1a and 2a was neut. and it opens pāda c here, we expect the neut. to continue, but masc. *bhrājáḥ ... sū́ryaḥ* immediately follows.

Contra Ge (and the publ. tr.), Re takes the neuters of d as appositive nominatives, and *paprathe* as intrans./refl. But it can surely just be self-involved.

X.170.4: Gender trouble continues. The vs. begins with a clear masc. part. *vibhrā́jan*, which is followed by neut. *svàr*, which I take as an appositive to the (unidentified) 2nd sg. subj. The first half-vs. is found also as VIII.98.3, where the 2nd sg. subj. is Indra and *svàḥ* is an unmarked simile.

Ge takes *rocanáṃ diváḥ* as another appositive in the nominative, not as acc. goal as I do (with Re).

Indra is called *viśvákarmā viśvádeváḥ* in VIII.98.2c, the pāda immediately preceding the repeated hemistich just noted.

X.171 Indra

X.171.2: Don tr. *makhásya dódhataḥ* as “of the rebellious Sacrifice,” presumably on the basis of PB VII.5.6 (also elsewhere in the Br), where the story of Makha and the gods is briefly told and Makha is identified with the sacrifice. Nothing in this vs. encourages that identification. Note that *-makha-* is found in a cmpd in the next hymn (X.172.2).

On *áva √bhṛ* see comm. ad VIII.93.23. As I say there, the lexeme can take an acc. of a body part, depicting bringing down an enemy by a downstroke that removes the body part – here severing the head clean from its body.

X.172 Dawn

On the structure of this hymn and its relation to early morning – though less so to Dawn proper – see publ. intro.

X.172.1: The *s*-stem *vánas-* is found independently only here (though it occurs regularly in cmpds like *gír-vanas-* ‘having a longing for songs’). It is completely unclear what it is meant to convey here, a lack of clarity made worse by the fact that the identity of the subject is unknown (Dawn? Sūrya?).

The end of b *yád ū́dhabhiḥ* must be construed apart from the rest of the pāda, since the verb *sacanta* is unaccented (so also Old). Something needs to be supplied, since “... the cows, when with udders” or “... cows, that is, with udders” doesn’t make sense as an independent unit. The instr. pl. *ū́dhabhiḥ* occurs 3x in the RV; once (VIII.9.19) it is construed with *duhré* “they give milk with their udders.” I therefore supply a preterital version of that verb here: the cows have been milked and are now going to pasture. Old rather “strotzen” and Ge “kommen.”

X.172.2: The cmpd. *jārayán-makha-* tr. by Ge “ der die Freigebigen weckt,” sim. Old (Gr takes it as a PN, an interpr. firmly rejected by Mayr PN). The problem is that *makhá-* doesn’t usually

mean ‘bounteous’, and in fact is used of a hostilely treated being in the immediately preceding hymn (X.171.2). On its dominant meaning ‘battling’ and its acquisition of the secondary ‘bounteous’ sense (via *maghá-*), see comm. ad I.18.9. Here I take the cmpd as a pun: Dawn is well known as one who both awakens and ages mortals, expressed by the homophonous *jā̆rā́yati* ‘awakens/ages’ (see my *-áya*-Formations 126–27, 154). Though Dawn herself can’t be the subj. here (because of masc. *máṃhiṣṭhaḥ*), the subj. is clearly a dawn-related being, who could perform the same dual actions. I suggest both parts of the cmpd are homonyms: *jārayán-* ‘awakening/aging’ and *makhá-* ‘bounteous/battler’. The splv. *máṃhiṣṭha-* ‘most bounteous’ helps attract the ‘bounteous’ sense of *makhá-* despite its primary meaning. (I would now modify my statement in *-áya*-formations [127 n. 4] that the cmpd (only) has the ‘awaken’ sense.)

X.172.4: The verb *vartayati* is construed with two preverbs in two different senses, at least in my interpr. (and basically Ge’s, though he toys with supplying a different verb in pāda a [n. 4ab]): *ápa* √*vṛt* ‘roll away’ / *sám* √*vṛt* ‘roll up together’.

vartaním returns from 1b.

X.173 Royal consecration

This hymn has been much treated: e.g., Don, Schlerath (*Königtum* 117–18), Ober (Relig. RV I.352). It is found in the AV (Ś VI.87-88, P XIX.6) and elsewhere. On *dhruvá-* ‘firm’ as its signature word, see publ. intro.

X.173.2: Note the insistent repetition of *ihá* (a, c, d).

X.173.6: Pāda a repeats 3b and reinforces the ritual aspects of the royal installation.

X.174 Praise of king

A companion piece to the preceding hymn – found in AVŚ I.29, AVP I.11. On the signature lexeme *abhí* √*vṛt* ‘roll over’, see publ. intro. Vss. 1–3 contain 10 pāda-initial occurrences of *abhí*; vs. 4 lacks this word, but the first word of b, *ábhavad*, mimics it (and vs. 4 is a borrowed vs. anyway). The final vs., 5, has *abhí* opening b.

X.174.1: Both AV versions substitute an amulet (*maṇí-*) for the oblation (*havíṣ-*) here – a nice illustration of the different effective means valued by the two textual traditions.

X.174.2: Both ab and cd are structured as “X and which Y” constructions, though with the “and” missing. In other words, in the second clause of each hemistich the acc. in the main clause has been gapped – although the pub. tr. has inserted it (“those” and “the one” respectively). A more literal tr. would be “over who are hostile ...” / “over who is envious ...,” which are in fact parsable in English.

X.174.3: This vs. is rather cunningly constructed: each of the first three pādas parcels out a bit of the syntax of the whole: pāda a has the preverb *abhí*, b the preverb plus the verb (*abhí ... avīvṛtat*), and c adds the obj., *víśvā bhūtā́ni*. Taking this last phrase as the obj. (with Ge and Zehnder et al. [AVP I online]) is preferable to taking it as subj. (so Wh, AVŚ).

X.174.4: This vs. is identical to X.159.4, a cowife hymn, with masc. *asapatnáḥ* instead of *asapatnā́*, spoken by the triumphant wife in 159.4. This is the only verse in our hymn lacking *abhí* (see above), and it surely has been borrowed into this hymn from X.159 – a conclusion supported by the fact that this hymn has too many vss. (5) for its place in the collection and that this vs. is not found in the corresponding AV versions.

X.175 Pressing stones

X.175.2: The "ruddy ones" (*usrā́ḥ*) are probably the soma plants; cf. "the red tree" (*vṛkṣásya ... aruṇásya*) that the pressing stones eat in X.94.3. See also Ge n. 2c.

X.175.4: This vs. is a near repetition of vs. 1, esp. in the 1st hemistich, providing a ring. Given this, their identical parts should be identical in tr., and so I would substitute "according to his ordinance" in 4b.

X.176 Agni

Despite my characterization of this as "a simple hymn" in the publ. intro., it reads more like a real RVic hymn, with unclear referents, metaphorical language, and bold imagery, than the straightforward, repetitive Athavan hymns among which it's found.

X.176.1: The identity of the "sons of the Ṛbhus" is not entirely clear. Ge, Re, and the publ. tr. take them as the offering fires or their flames; see esp. Ge's n. 1a, where he argues that the Ṛbhus are priests, here associated with the kindling of the ritual fire (though this is not their usual ambit). Old is dubious, in part because of the verb *navanta* 'bellow' – but this isn't much of an argument, since flames are always making roaring noises in the RV.

With most, I take *vṛjáṇā* as a nom. pl. appositive to the sons of the Ṛbhus, but what aspect of this multifaceted word (on which see comm. ad X.28.2) is being referred to here is unclear. In its physical manifestation as 'enclosure, circle', it could refer to the fireplaces themselves or to the circle of flames; in its metaphorical meaning, to the community of fires or flames. Interpr. vary – see Old, Ge, and Re.

kṣā́mā with long final vowel is found twice elsewhere in the RV: IV.2.16 and X.45.4. Although in all three cases the Pp. reads short-vowel *kṣā́ma*, I think all three are elliptical duals, for *dyā́vākṣā́mā* 'heaven and earth' (see comm. ad locc. for the first two), though here (as in the other passages) the standard tr. take it as sg. In our passage the flames feed (*áśnan*) on heaven and earth: since flames reach towards heaven while being grounded on earth, a dual source of food makes sense.

It is in this context that I interpr. *viśvádhāyasaḥ*. The interpr. of *-dhāyas-* cmpds is tricky; see comm. ad III.44.3, X.67.7. They can mean 'having nourishment for X', with the first member the beneficiary/consumer of the nourishment, but can also have an adj. first member, e.g., *hári-dhāyas-* 'having golden nourishment'. Ge and Re both interpr. it in the former sense: 'all-nourishing', i.e., 'having nourishment for all'. But this seems to contradict the verb phrase "they feed on H+E." Although I render almost all of the 11 occurrences of this cmpd as "all-nourishing," all of them could also be interpr. as having an adjectival first member "having all nourishment(s)" – it is difficult to identify a diagnostic context that would distinguish between the two. Such bahuvrīhis can be further interpr. not only as 'providing XY' but as

‘deriving/acquiring XY’, and here the latter sense seems in play – as they feed on H+E they derive universal nourishment.

X.176.3: In I.35.4, adduced by Ge, *abhī́vṛta-* is used of an extravagantly decorated chariot. But the insistent use of the aggressive lexeme *abhí* √*vṛt* ‘roll over’ in nearby X.174 should not be forgotten.

X.176.4: As indicated in the publ. tr., the sense of the first hemistich is obscure, though the syntax is not complex. The verb *uruṣyá-* lit. ‘make wide (space)’, fig. ‘deliver/release’ takes an abl. Here the VP can be construed either as “delivers (himself) from his immortal birth, as it were” (so the publ. tr.) or “... from his birth as if from the immortal.” It is also possible that the abl. *jánmanaḥ* can have a temporal sense as well. I think there may be a play on the ablatives in b: Agni delivers himself from his immortal birth (as a god) after his birth (on the ritual ground), reading *jánmanaḥ* twice. And this may further suggest that Agni inhabits the domain *between* birth and death/immortality, that is, the human realm, where people live – not the divine realm of non-death. This idea may be reinforced by “he was made for living” in d.

X.177 Pataṃga

On this hymn, see now also Köhler (*Kavi*, 123–25). I will not speculate on the mystical import of the hymn – there’s quite enough of that by others. The grammar is fairly straightforward.

X.177.1–2: On *pataṃgá-* in these two vss., also extracted by the Anukr. to name the poet of the hymn, see comm. ad I.116.4. Although I consider it originally to have meant ‘going on the wing’, in this late hymn the semantic transition to ‘bird’ has surely been effected.

X.177.1: I would now substitute “uncanny” for “magic.” The phrase *ásurasya māyáyā* is found twice in the Mitra-Varuṇa hymn V.63 (vss. 3, 7); see also IX.73.9 *váruṇasya māyáyā*. The use of *māyā́-* may almost approach the later sense of the word, “illusion” or “power of illusion.” That is, the lord’s *māyā́-* may conjure up the vision of a bird that is only visible mentally and then only to adepts.

X.177.2: In c *svaryàm* poses two problems. Since it’s modifying *tā́m ... manīṣā́m*, it should be fem. and therefore belong to a *vṛkī*-stem *svarī́-* (so, sort of, Gr, who sneaks it into the lemma for *svaryà-*). Also, the various tr. take it as ‘sunlike’, ‘sonnenhaft’ – understandably, given the visual context -- but *svaryà-* always refers to noise, and so I tr. it.

X.177.3: Various referents have been suggested for the fem. plurals in c (e.g., Ge ‘waters’). Given the return of “see” from vs. 1: 1b *paśyanti*, 3a *ápaśyam*, I’m in favor of bringing back the light rays (*márīcī-*) of 1d.

Note also a potential reverse phonetic figure: *pataṃ-gá-* (1a) and *go-pā́-* (3a), esp. since the most obvious referent for *gopā́m* is the bird, who is the object of “see” in 1ab as well.

X.178 Tārkṣya

On the subj. of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.178.1: For the collocation of √*sah* and √*tṛ* in connection with a horse, see III.49.3 *sahā́vā pṛtsú taráṇir nā́rvā* "victorious in battles like an overtaking steed."

Since Tārkṣya is obviously a horse, *áriṣṭanemi-* modifying him obviously doesn't ascribe a wheel felly to the body of the horse itself, but rather to the associated chariot. Still Scar's tr. (15) "der macht, dass der Radkranz unversehrt bleibt" seems a little overfussy.

X.178.1–2: As Old already noted, pādas 1d and 2b play off each other:1d *svàstaye ... ihā́ huvema* / 2b *svàstaye ... ivā́ ruhema*, with *ihā́* and *ivā́* differing from each other only in the interior consonant and the two 1st pl. optatives having near-mirror-image root syllables.

X.178.2: The referent of the dual in cd is unclear to me. Ge takes it as Heaven and Earth, but this requires ignoring, or rather aggressively reinterpreting, the simile particle *ná*, which seems to me unequivocally to mark (unnamed) H+E , identified by their standard descriptions, as the comparandum. Old decides H+E are a second comparandum serving as obj. to *ā́ ruhema* "we board T. like a boat, like you two, H+E," but this doesn't help. First, that second simile doesn't make sense: how are H+E like a racehorse to mount? And the discord between 2nd ps. *vām* and the duals in the simile is disturbing. I don't have a solution to the identity problem, but I suspect that it's some dual entity connected with horse tackle or chariot parts.

X.178.3: A satisfyingly constructed simile with three parts (nom., instr., acc.), with all three expressed in both simile and frame.

Acdg. to Ge (n. 3d), a "youthful arrow" is one that still has its feathers and so on.

X.179 Indra

On the ritual context of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.179.1: The context strongly favors Ge's rendering of *mamattána* as "so wartet noch," fld. by publ. tr. "wait!" This should belong with √*man*[2] 'wait', on which see comm. ad X.27.20. The problem is that the other forms belonging to this root have clear *man* forms, but this appears to belong to √*mad* (so assigned by Gr). There is a complex way to get this form by analogy, however. The impv. in X.27.20 *mamandhi* 'wait!' is properly analyzed as *maman-dhi*, but could instead be **mamand-dhi*, as if to a root √*mand* 'wait' (distinct from the secondary root √*mand* 'be exhilarated' derived from √*mad* 'id.'), with simplification of the geminate in a cluster. From such a putative underlying form, a zero-grade stem *mamad-* could be derived; with the 2nd pl. ending *-tána* the result will be our *mamat-tána*. This is perhaps over-clever, but the contextual meaning 'wait' is so clear that fiddling around with a "become/make exhilarated' meaning here would be senseless.

X.179.2: On *kulapā́* see Ge (n. 2d) and, somewhat less illuminating, Scar (302). As Ge points out, the other early attestation of this stem (AVŚ I.14.3) specifically identifies the referent as feminine.

On *vrājápati-* as 'Einpferchungsmeister' see KH (Aufs. 572 n. 22).

X.180 Indra

X.180.3: In the voc. phrase *vṛṣabha carṣaṇīnā́m* the gen. has its ordinary accent. See Old.

X.181 All Gods

On the ritual context of this hymn see publ. intro.

X.181.3: I would now slightly alter the tr. to "did they carry ...," since impfs. should not have immed. past sense (per IH).

X.182 Bṛhaspati

X.183 Birth of a son

For the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.183.1–2: In pāda a of both vss., I take *mánasā* both with the preceding *ápaśyam* and the following participle (*cékitānam* / *dī́dhyānām*).

X.183.2: On *tanū́* see AiG III.188. It belongs to the category of endingless locatives discussed by TY (WECIEC Proceedings 2022).

X.184 Birth charm

X.185 Aditi

X.185.2: Old follows Benfey in emending *vāraṇéṣu* to *vā́raṇeṣu* < *vā áraneṣu* "or on alien ways": clever, but as Ge (n. 2b) points out, not nec.

X.185.2–3: Ge (n. 2a) convincingly takes *téṣām* (2a) as the antecedent of *yásmai* (3a), with change of number – rather than referring to the gods in vs. 1. This fits the Weltbild much better.

X.186 Vāyu

X.187 Agni

X.188 Agni

X.188.2: On *vípravīra-* see comm. ad IX.44.5.

X.189 Sārparājñī or Sūrya

On the dedicand of the hymn, see publ. intro. I will not contribute to the abundant speculation on the identities and activities of the actors in the hymn, for which see Old., Ge, and Re (ÉVP XV) inter alia.

X.189.1: This vs. contains a rare ex. of splitting an NP across a hemistich boundary: *mātáram* ... / *pitáraṃ ca*. Of course in Gāyatrī the boundary between pādas b and c is less rigid than in meters with hemistichs of equal numbers of pādas.

In c it is possible (with Re and as an alt. of Ge's [n. 1c]) to take *svàḥ* as an appositive to the subj.; "going forth as the sun."

X.189.2: This vs. seems to have induced a certain amount of grammatical confusion in our usually reliable tr. + comm.

Ge, Old (with a great deal of verbiage), and Re (in comm. but not in tr.) take *rocanā́* as fem. nom. sg. -- but *rocaná-* is not an adj., but a neut. noun. The other supposed fem. nom. sg. of this stem in III.61.5 (adduced by Ge and Old) should not be so interpr.; see comm. ad loc.

Re also tr. *rocanā́* as "les deux domaines-lumineux," though the dual of this neut. *-a*-stem would be *rocané* – and despite the fact that in his comm. he assumes "une haplologie **rocanā́* (nt. **pl.**) + *rocanā́* (fem. sg.)" (my bolding). Re's invented dual must result from the fact that *antár √car* 'wander between' can take a dual, as in I.173.3 *antár dūtó ná ródasī carad vā́k* "Speech wanders between the two worlds like a messenger." But the pl. is also possible; cf. I.95.10 *antár návāsu carati prasū́ṣu* "he roams within the new, fruitful (plants)." The form *rocanā́* then is a neut. pl., and only a neut. pl.

As Re points out, this vs. contains the first trace of the opposition of breaths: *prá √an* (*prāná-*) and *ápa √an* (*apāná-*), already very prominent in the AV.

X.189.3: On *pataṃgá-* see comm. ad I.116.4; as in X.177.1–2 (q.v.), the stem seems to have developed into a synonyms for 'bird'.

X.190 Cosmogonic

X.190.3: There are three matched pairs serving as obj. of *akalpayat*; as JSK (DGRV II.85–86) points out, they show three different patterns of conjunction: dual dvandva: *sūryācandramásau* (though with only one accent); double *ca*: *dívaṃ ca pṛthivī́ṃ ca*; and the rather loose *átha* + *u*: *antárikṣam átho svàḥ*. As he also points out, these correspond to different degrees of semantic cohesion between the two members of the pair.

X.191 Unity

On the purpose of the hymn and its placement in the Saṃhitā, see publ. intro. The preverb *sám* 'together' and the adj. *samāná-* 'common' dominate the hymn: there are 6 occurrences of *sám* in the 1st two vss. (incl. the doubled *sáṃ-sam* that opens the hymn) and 8 occurrences of *samāná-* in the last two vss., as well as one of *sámiti-* 'assembly' and two of *sahá* / *súsaha* 'together (with)'.

X.191.2: The use of *pū́rve* 'earlier, of long ago' with the pres. *upā́sate* is a bit jarring, but I think the point is that the gods' agreement made earlier had long-lasting effects into the present, just as ours presumably will.