

Commentary VI

VI.1 Agni

VI.1.1: As noted ad loc., the first hymn of Maṇḍala IV begins identically (IV.1.1.a): *tvám hí agne*, with the same puzzling use of ordinarily causal *hí* in the first pāda of a hymn. It might be possible here to tr. the first hemistich as a causal clause subordinate to cd: “Because ... you became the first minder of this insightful thought and the Hotar, you made ...”

On the stem *manótar-* see comm. ad II.9.4 and IV.1.16, 5.10. Note also that the HvN pausal resolution of the word as *manóta* is faulty; it should end in a long *-ā*.

Ge construes the gen. *asyā dhiyāḥ* with both *manótā* and *hótā*, but the latter doesn’t usually govern a genitive.

The *sīm* in c presumably refers to the *dhī-* of b. The publ. tr. could be slightly altered to “made it into power ...”; so Ge “... machtest es zu ... Macht.” On the infinitival construction in cd, see also Keydana (253). Note the attraction of the object of *sāhadhyai* into the dative case (*vísvasmai sāhase*). Pāda d is also noteworthy in having three forms of \sqrt{sah} , though two belong to the same *s*-stem.

VI.1.2: Pāda b ends with one of the rare examples of non-concessive *sán*, nom. sg. m. pres. part. to \sqrt{as} . Its presence here may be due to an effort at metrical adjustment. The stem *īḍya-* is almost invariably read distracted as here, and it is extremely common in pāda-final position. This is fine for dimeter meter and for Jagatī, but the distracted stem obviously doesn’t fit a Triṣṭubh cadence. The addition of monosyllabic *sán* allows such a cadence here. Note also that *sán* rhymes with *gman*, which closes the next two hemistichs (2d, 3b). The only ex. of a non-distracted form of *īḍya-* (save for a lone Xth Maṇḍala gen. sg.) is found likewise in a Triṣṭubh cadence in IV.24.2 *sá vrtrahátye hávyah sá īḍyah*, where a non-distracted *īḍyah* sits uncomfortably after a distracted *háv’yah*. So, two different solutions to the problem of fitting *īḍya-* into a Triṣṭubh cadence.

Ge suggests that the second hemistich “spielt auf Agni’s Flucht ins Wasser an.” I don’t myself see this, and I do not know what his evidence is, beyond *ánu gman* ‘have followed’. In this ritual context, the “god-seeking men” “have followed Agni first,” because he is the conduit of their offerings to the gods and the divinity who is installed in their own houses. They must go through him, as it were, to reach the gods. The first hemistich emphasizes this ritual connection: Agni “sits down” (that is, is installed) as Hotar and superior sacrificer, and the place where he is installed is specified as “the footprint of refreshment” (*ilás padé*), a kenning for the ritual ground (see, for a similar installation scenario, I.128.1 and II.10.1).

On *mahó rāyé* see comm. ad IV.31.11. The interp. of the rest of pāda d is uncertain, primarily because of the multiply ambiguous *citáya-* stem. The pāda most resembles V.15.5 *mahó rāyé citáyann átrim aspah*, rendered by Ge as “du hast jetzt zu grossem Reichtum dich offenbarend dem Atri (aus der Not) herausgeholfen” (though in our passage here he takes *citáyantah* as “aufmerksam,” a completely

different sense of *citáya-*) and in the publ. tr. (JPB) as “...then appearing greatly for wealth, you have rescued Atri.” My publ. tr. here (“distinguishing themselves”) is closest to Ge’s tr. of V.15.5, though I think it adds a crucial element. The point must (or at least may) be that the men seek to make especially conspicuous offerings to the gods, via Agni, for the sake of acquiring the wealth that accrues to the successful sacrificer. The apparent reflexive tr. ‘distinguish oneself’ is really just an extension of the common value of *citáya-* ‘appear’/ ‘appear (good), be conspicuous’. Re’s “fixant leur pensée sur la richesse (pour l’atteindre) grandement” is an extension of Ge’s “attentive” sense, but I think he has extended too far.

VI.1.3: The first hemistich of this vs. presents some difficulties. One of the problems is that the acc. *yántam* in the first pāda most naturally invites Agni as referent, since the main verb of the clause, *ánu gman*, is the same as in 2cd, where Agni was definitely the acc. complement. But in pāda b Agni is represented by a loc. *tvé* and there is a different acc. *rayím*. One solution has been to construe *rayím* loosely (or not so loosely) with the pf. part. *jāgrvāṃsaḥ*, leaving *yántam* in pāda a as the only acc. with *ánu gman*. This is the solution Old favors (ZDMG 55.271–72 = KISch 730–31: “bei dir Reichthum erwachend”), but \sqrt{gr} ‘be awake’ does not otherwise take an acc. Both Ge and Re supply a parenthetical non-finite verb more or less dependent on *jāgrvāṃsaḥ* to govern ‘wealth’: “das sie bei dir Reichthum (erwartend) gewacht haben” and “... vigilants, (pour atteindre) en toi la richesse.” Since I prefer not to supply anything I don’t have to, I’ve tried another tack -- making *yántam* (with Agni as referent) and *rayím* conjoined goals of *ánu gman*. In other words, the wakeful men (presumably the priests alert at the sacrifice) pursue both Agni as he comes with goods and the goods themselves that are nearby him after he has deposited them on the ritual ground. I don’t, however, find this very satisfactory -- though I don’t find the other possibilities satisfying either (and I simply don’t understand Ludwig’s interpr., as reported by Old, 271–72 = 730–31). Somewhat in favor of my interpr. is Re’s comment that *tvé rayím ... ánu gman* is a “variation inorganique” (whatever he means by that adj.) of *tvā .. rāyē ... ánu gman*. I would rephrase it slightly to say that my “they follow you *and* wealth”(3ab) is a variant (inorganic or not) of “they follow you *for* wealth” (2cd).

In any case, the string of accusatives in cd all clearly refer to Agni, and we are back on firm ground.

VI.1.4: Again Ge claims that this verse is about the myth of the flight of Agni, presumably on the basis of *padám devásya ... vyántaḥ*, but the track of the god doesn’t have to be his flight, but simply the ritual cursus.

How one interprets the larger sense of the vs. depends on how one interprets the verb forms: *āpan*, *dadhire*, and *raṇayanta*, esp. the first. Both Ge and Re take *āpan* as preterital (“... haben sie ... erlangt,” “ont obtenu”), presumably taking it as a pluperfect or a thematic aorist (both either augmented or not) to $\sqrt{āp}$, and Ge clearly thinks the subj. is the Aṅgirasas. (Gr takes it as an aor.) But nothing prevents it from being a pf. subjunctive. In that case, the priests pursuing the ritual cursus in a, who

are seeking fame (*śravasyāvaḥ*), will obtain fame through their priestly activities. The pf. *dadhire* in c can then have, as often, immediate past reference (“they have assumed names”), and the injunctive *raṇayanta* in d is easily compatible with that scenario as a general timeless presential. Because of the otherwise exclusive focus on the ritual function of Agni in this hymn, my interpr. seems preferable to one that goes haring off into the mythological past.

Note *śrávaḥ ... ámr̥ktam* “indestructible fame” as a variation on the formula *śrávaḥ ... ákṣitam*.

VI.1.5: The referent of the phrase “both riches of the people” (*rāya ubháyāso jánānām*) is not entirely clear. The standard assumption is that it refers to material goods of some sort, but which are the two kinds? Ge (n. 5b) cites Sāy on the TB for heavenly and earthly riches -- though Sāy on our passage suggests rather (domestic) animals and non-animals (*paśvapaśurūpāṇi*). Ge’s own suggestion is our own goods and those of our enemies, based on VII.83.5 *yuvám hí vásva ubháyasya rājathah*, where the publ. tr. (jpb) tentatively suggests rather those of war and peace. Acdg. to Re, they are material and spiritual goods, which he thinks are *rayí-* and *vásu-* respectively -- a completely arbitrary and ad hoc differentiation of these two extremely common stems, not supported in other passages as far as I can see. Ge’s interpr. is more plausible, but it seems strange to announce that goods of whatever sort “strengthen” Agni -- esp. as in vss. 2–3 Agni is depicted as the bringer and provider of goods for us. I have a completely different view of the phrase -- that it refers metaphorically to manpower. In VI.14.3 the “riches of the stranger” (*rāyo aryāḥ*) contend with each other (*spárdhante*), where the verb invites an animate referent for the subject. Moreover, *ubháya-* regularly refers to two different groups of beings: e.g., I.60.2 *ubháyāsaḥ ... uśíjo yé ca mártāḥ* “both ... his (ancient) priests and mortals (now)”; II.2.12 *ubháyāsaḥ ... stotāraḥ ... sūráyaś ca* “both praisers and patrons.” In II.6.7 *jánmobháyā* “both breeds” refers to the human and divine races, similarly *jātām ubháyān* in IV.2.2. Here either human/divine or patrons/singers (or some other division of mortals) would be possible, but I favor the latter, given the concentration on humans and their ritual activities here.

VI.1.6: Pāda b *hótā ... ní śasāda yájīyān* closely echoes 2a *ádhā hótā ny āsīdo yájīyān*. The opening of pāda c (as well as 7a), *tám tvā*, also matches 2c, and *dīdivāṃsam* of c matches the same adj. in 3d.

Whatever the exact posture described by *jñubādhah* (for detailed disc. see Scar 343–45), the Engl. idiom “on bended knee” conveys the same sense of physical reverence.

VI.1.6–7: I do not understand why 6c has the act. pf. part. *dīdivāṃsam* while, in the same metrical position, qualifying the same entity, an apparently meaning the same thing, 7c has the middle part. *dīdiyānaḥ* (whose tense-aspect stem affiliation is not entirely clear: its accent weakly suggests that it already belongs to the new redupl. pres. [reinterpreted from the pf.], but the redupl. forms to this root are in flux; see my

“perfect impv” paper in the Lubotsky Fs.). Of course a nom. form of the act. part would not fit this slot in 7c, an acc. form of the middle part. would be fine in 6c. I doubt that the poet is contrasting old perfect and new pres., or trying to draw a semantic difference between the voices. The participle *dīdiyāna-* is the only medial form to this root; all the finite forms are active, with intrans. value, as are the two act. participles, old-style pf. *dīdivāṃs-* and new-style redupl. pres. *dīdyant-*.

VI.1.7-8: Both Ge and Re take *návyam* in 7a as an adv. (e.g., “aufs neue”), but since the adj. *návyā-* in the nom. (hence not a possible adverb) regularly qualifies Agni (V.12.3, VII.4.8, VIII.11.10, X.4.5), I see no reason not to take it as an adj. here. The reference of course is to the newly kindled ritual fire.

Ge, flg. Ludwig, thinks that 7c concerns battle, which again I find difficult to see. I am more persuaded by Proferes’s reading (pp. 29–30), that the hymn in general presents Agni as the fire held in common by the larger community and that in vss. 7–8 “this common fire is a symbol of centralized sovereignty,” therefore a leader of the clans and, in 8a the clan-lord of each and every clan.

Vs. 8 is couched entirely in the acc., referring to Agni. It can’t be directly attached to either what immediately precedes or what immediately follows, since both 7cd and 9ab have Agni in the nom. However, it follows nicely after the accusatives in 7ab, with 7cd an intrusion. To indicate that the description of Agni is in the acc., I have resupplied “we implore” from 7b.

On the semantics of the root $\sqrt{tuś}$ in *nitósana-*, see comm. ad VIII.38.2.

The hapax cmpd. *prētīṣaṇi-* is curiously formed and its sense not entirely clear, esp. because the root affiliation of *-iṣaṇi-* is uncertain and because the cmpd type is muddled, at least by its interpreters. Ge takes the 2nd member with $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’: “der das Auftreten (des Opferpriesters) wünscht”; while Re opts for $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘impel’: “qui pousse en avant l’incitation,” with alternatives in the notes “qui aspire à aller de l’avant” ($\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’) or “qui fait avancer l’incitation (des humains)” ($\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘impel’). The ‘seek, desire’ root is also represented by Debrunner’s “zum Vormarsch strebend” (AiG II.2.208). In my interpr. I take Old’s point (Noten ad loc.; he doesn’t discuss in ZDMG 55) that the accent suggests a bahuvrīhi, and I favor a connection of the 2nd member with $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘impel’ and esp. the 2ndary verbal stems *iṣanaya-* and *iṣaṇya-*, both ‘impel’. A literal rendering would then be something like “having the impulsion of the forward progress (of the sacrifice),” but in English the bahuvrīhi gloss is too awkward, hence my “impelling ...” The point here is that Agni controls the pace and movement of the sacrifice, which progress is often expressed by the idiom *prá \sqrt{i}* (cf. the common loc. absol. *prayaty ādhvaré* “while the ceremony is advancing”) found in the 1st member *prēti-*. The 2nd member *iṣaṇi-* is immediately followed by the part. *iṣáyantam*, but I think this is a playful juxtaposition: the two words have nothing to do with each other, and the sense ‘prospering’ for the latter was established in the fuller expression in 2b.

VI.1.9: There are a few small questions in this vs. In b both Ge and Re take instr. *samīdhā* as referring to the concrete material kindling stick, as often -- while I think

it refers to abstractly to the moment of kindling (as also, in my view, in VI.2.5 and quite possibly VI.5.5). The abstract sense is allowed by Scar (52–53), and the fact that the dat. to the same stem, *samídhe*, can be used as an infinitive (see, inter alia, Keydana 186 n. 160) supports this interpr. It has to be admitted, though, that the same instr. in the following vs. (10b) does refer to the physical object.

In c my “knows his way around” is a literal calque of *pári védā* into an English idiom (cf. almost identical passage I.31.5). (A more chaste rendering would have been “thoroughly knows.”) In both passages we might have expected univerbation of the preverb and verb with loss of accent on *pári* in the rel. cl.; I have no explanation for why this did not happen, save for the possibility that *pári* does not function as a conventional preverb but as an adverb or postposition and also given the fact that such univerbation is not generally obligatory.

Ge and Re take c with d rather than ab; this is certainly possible and there are no implications either way.

VI.1.10: The doubling of the 2nd sg. enclitic *te* by init. *asmaí*, the here-and-now demonstrative, is somewhat unusual, though in the same general vein as *tām tvā* (2c, 6c, 7a).

Ge and Re (see also Klein I.329, Oberlies II.133) take *védī* as a loc., but in this passage, embedded in a long series of instrumentals, there seems no reason not to interpr. it as the instr. it appears to be. See AiG III.155, where Wack identifies it as an instr. here. The very similar passage VI.13.4 *yás te sūno sahaso gīrbhír ukthāḥ ... vedyānaḥ* (that is, probably to be emended to **védyānaḥ* and analyzed **védyā ...*), supports the instr. interpr. -- which is argued for for both passages by Bloomfield (RR ad VI.1.10) and Old (Noten ad VI.13.4).

Re (see also Klein I.52, 71) take *bhāsā, śrávobhiś ca* as a conjoined NP, with Re putting immediately following *śravasyāḥ* into a separate syntagm (Klein doesn’t treat anything but the two nouns). Although *ca* does generally conjoin nominals, both the pāda break between the instrumentals and the etymological figure *śrávobhiḥ ... śravasyāḥ* suggest that the two instr. belong with different parts of the clause.

VI.1.12–13: These two vss. play on the two words *purú-* ‘many’ and *vásu-* ‘good’ in this final explosion of begging for a suitable return from the god.

VI.1.12: I take *nṛvát* as an adverb, since this neut. is almost always so used. Ge and Re instead take it as a full adj. ‘consisting of men, accompanied by men’ modifying a gapped noun (Besitz, la richesse) and implicitly parallel to *bhūri ... paśvāḥ* “abundance of livestock.” I am not convinced, and curiously the passage Ge cites in his n. 10a as support for the interpr. contains a *nṛvát* that must be adverbial. Still, I do have to admit that a few such expressions do exist outside of the neut. sg.: I.92.7 *nṛvátah ... vājān*, IX.93.5 *rayīm ... nṛvántam*.

VI.2 Agni

VI.2.1–2: The opening of the first hymn in this maṇḍala, *tvám hí* (see above), is replicated in the first two vss. of this hymn. The *hí* is similarly hard to account for in both these vss.

VI.2.1: The etymology and therefore the sense of the vṛddhi form *kṣáita-* (IX.97.3), *kṣáitavant-* (here) are disputed; see EWA s.v. The question is whether it belongs with *kṣiti-* ‘settlement’ (Aves. *ṣiti-*), etc., to $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘dwell’, or is the counterpart of YAves *xšaēta-* ‘lordly’ vel sim., to $\sqrt{kṣā}$ ‘rule over’. As the Avestan forms show, the two interpr. are not etymologically compatible. With Ge (hesitantly) and Re (sim. AiG II.2.127 [though see 933]), I have opted for the former. For one thing the various ‘people, settlement’ words are prominent in this run of hymns: *kṣiti-* VI.1.5, *carṣaṇi-* in this vs. and twice in the next (VI.2.2), as well as VI.1.8, *vís-* VI.1.8, and it also makes sense for Agni, as the ritual fire in the household and the focus of the extended family and clan unit, to be associated here with the glory of those people. Another reason emerges from consideration of the whole vs.: the verb stem *púšya-* (see *pušyasi* pāda d) is formulaically associated with *kṣéti* ‘dwells in peace’, belonging to the same root $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘dwell’ (cf. *kṣéti púšyati* I.64.13, 83.3, VII.32.9 and similar expressions); see esp. in this very same hymn VI.2.5cd ... *sá pušyati, kṣáyam* ... “he prospers his dwelling place.” However, the other interpr., ‘lordly’, is certainly not excluded, esp. since both occurrences of *kṣáita-* are associated with *yáśas-* ‘glory’ (*kṣáitavad yáśaḥ* here; *yaśástaro yaśásām kṣáitaḥ* IX.97.3 of Soma).

The simile *puṣṭīm ná pušyasi* “you prosper X like prosperity” seems a bit lame. I suppose the idea was to capture the cognate accusative. Or it can be a placeholder for *pušyati kṣáyam* in vs. 5 and the very awkwardness of the first expression focuses attention on the “repaired” (or perhaps “enhanced”) phrase in vs. 5.

VI.2.2: I doubt that the *vājín-* of the 2nd hemistich is just any horse. It could be a mythical horse: Dadhikrā is called *vājín-* *viśvákrṣṭi-* “a prize-winner belonging to all communities” in IV.38.2. Or a god, perhaps Soma, Indra, or the Sun.

VI.2.3: The standard tr. take *juhvé* to \sqrt{hu} ‘pour, offer’, but this causes a problem with the main cl. verb, the pres. *indhate* ‘kindle’, if we assume that the pf. of \sqrt{hu} has some kind of preterital sense. It does not make ritual sense to offer the melted butter in the fire before kindling it. Ge avoids the problem by translating with a present, but this is ad hoc. With Sāy. I take the verb to $\sqrt{hvā}$ ‘call’ instead, since invocations can be and regularly are made after the fire is kindled. Although Kü follows the \sqrt{hu} interpr. (605), he admits that the alternative should be seriously considered (n. 1316). It might be objected that a pf. to the set root $\sqrt{hvā}$ should be read trisyllabically (*juh^{ve}*), as it indeed is in X.149.5, but as Kü points out (n. 1317), an undoubted 3rd sg. pf. to $\sqrt{hvā}$, *juhve* in I.32.6, is disyllabic. (The sequencing of actions problem with \sqrt{idh} -- \sqrt{hu} could be avoided if the former means something like ‘fan the flames’, an action that could indeed follow the pouring of the butter into a banked fire. But I don’t know that we have any evidence for this sense -- beyond the fact that

indhate belongs to a pres. stem and could have durative value.) For further support for my interpr. of this vs. see immed. below.

VI.2.4–5: These two vss. are in some ways an expansion of VI.1.9: 4ab are the equivalent of VI.1.9a (for disc. see below); 5ab corresponds to VI.1.9bc. Note esp. VI.1.9b *yás ta ānaṭ samídhā havyádātīm* “who after kindling you [lit. with the kindling of you] has achieved your oblation-giving” and VI.2.5ab *samídhā yás ta āhutīm, nísitīm mārtyo náśat* “The mortal who after kindling (you) [lit. with the kindling (of you)] will achieve the offering to you and the whetting of you.” (A side note: *havyádātīm* in VI.1.9b is the counterpart of *āhutīm* in VI.2.5a, but note that VI.1.9 also has *āhutīm* in the immediately following pāda (c).) In both VI.1.9b and VI.2.5a the root noun instr. *samídhā* seems to express priority of action: “with X (then) Y” → “after X (then) Y.” If this interpr. is correct, it provides support for my assertion ad VI.2.3 that kindling must precede oblation and therefore the pf. *juhvé* cannot belong to \sqrt{hu} ‘pour’. For further evidence for the priority of kindling to oblation, see II.37.6 *jóṣi agne samídhāṃ jóṣi āhutīm*, VIII.19.5 *yáḥ samídhā yá āhutī / yó védena dadāśa mārto agnáye*, X.52.2 *brahmā samíd bhavati sāhutir vām*.

It might be observed in passing that the temporal priority I’m assigning to the instr. *samídhā* also accounts for a much more widespread syntacto-semantic development -- that of the standard preterital use of the gerund. Since by most lights the gerund in *-tvā* (and most likely the one in *-ya*) is a frozen instr., we can envision a development of the type “with going” → “having gone,” etc. See my review of Tikkanen, *The Sanskrit Gerund* (1987), in *JAOS* 109 (1989): 459-61.

VI.2.4: The problematic form in this vs. is the first word *ṛdhat*. It clearly belongs with the root aor. attested primarily in the opt. (*ṛdhyāma*, etc.) but also found once in the participle *ṛdhánt-*, with expected suffixal accent. It is the root accent that distinguishes the form here. Old (ZDMG 55.279 = KISch 738; also Noten) suggests that it is a neut. part. used adverbially, with accent shift (**ṛdhát* → *ṛdhat*) -- claiming that adverbial accent shift can go either way, simply marking an oppositional formation. But the standard exx. (*dravát* to *drávati*) involve a rightward shift, and in any case the whole notion of adverbial accent shift has recently been called into question (see Emily Barth’s Cornell diss.). Re considers both possibilities and opts finally for the adverb, while Ge takes it as a finite form. I prefer to take it as an aor. subjunctive (see also Lub, *Concordance*, where it is so identified) parallel to *śaśámate*. Although I cannot entirely explain the zero-grade root syllable for expected full-grade **árdhat* (though see below), I can suggest a local explanation for the (supposedly) unexpected root accent. The next hymn contains the hapax verbal-governing cmpd. *ṛdhád-vāra-* ‘bringing wishes to success’. Whatever the original grammatical identity of the 1st members of this fairly common cmpd. type, synchronically they appear to be neut. sg. participles in *-át* with accent consistently on the suffix (type *bharád-vāja-* [in fact, the name of the poet of this hymn and of the VIth Maṇḍala in general], *dhārayát-kavi-*, etc.; see AiG II.1.317–20), and the verbal stems from which they are derived regularly are accented one syllable to the left. So,

for the examples just given, 1st class pres. *bhāṛati*, -āya-formation *dhārāyati*, etc. I would therefore suggest that our poet, who had *ṛdhāt-vāra-* in his repertoire, back-formed the root-accented finite form *ṛdhat* on this model. A possibly simpler alternative is to begin with a hypothetical root aorist paradigm, whose injunctive act. sg. **ārdham*, **ārd/t*, **ārd/t* should have full grade and root accent and whose subjunctive should likewise have both: **ārdhā(ni)*, **ārdhas(i)*, **ārdhat(i)* (cf. injunc. *kār* and subj. *kāṛati*, e.g.). As it happens, the root aor. of $\sqrt{\text{rdh}}$ is attested only in forms where we expect zero-grade root and suffixal accent, but the starred forms just given are the paradigmatically expected act. sg. forms. Under this explanation, the root accent of subjunctive **ṛdhat* is not the problem; its zero grade is. And we can explain that either by the influence (at time of composition or of redaction) of *ṛdhād-vāra-* in VI.3.2 or by the absence of other attested full-grade verbal forms to this root (though cf. gerundive *ārdhya-*) and consequent generalization of the zero-grade. Of the two explanations just given, I mildly favor the first – in part because the poet Bharadvāja would have been acutely aware of the accentual properties of his name.

A minor support for the interpr. of *ṛdhat* as finite subjunctive, not adverbially used participle is provided by formulaics. As Re sketches, $\sqrt{\text{rdh}}$ can take *yajñām* as object; cf. X.110.2 *mānmāni dhībhīr utā yajñām ṛndhān* “bringing the thoughts and the sacrifice to fulfillment through his visionary thoughts.” The VP *yajñām ṛdhat* “bring sacrifice to fulfillment” can be seen as a variant of simplex $\sqrt{\text{yaj}}$ ‘sacrifice’, and $\sqrt{\text{yaj}}$ and $\sqrt{\text{śam}}$ form a conjoined pair for our poet in nearby hymns: VI.1.9 *só agne īje śāsāme ca mārto* “O Agni, that mortal has sacrificed and ritually labored” and VI.3.2 (the same vs. that contains *ṛdhād-vāra-*) *ījé yajñébhiḥ śāsāmé sámībhiḥ* “he has sacrificed with sacrifices, he has labored with ritual labors.”

X.110.2 quoted above also suggests that, despite the pāda break, *dhiyā* in our passage is better construed with *ṛdhat* as in the publ. tr. than with *śāsāmate* with, e.g., Ge “... (und) mit Andacht den Dienst versieht.”

Note the sandhi *ūtī śá*, with retroflexion despite the lack of a close syntactic connection, as well as the unusual position of ordinarily pāda-init. *śá*. An incomplete collection of relevant passages shows that this retroflexion of non-initial *śá* in ruki contexts is standard but not invariable: IV.26.4 *prá sú śá* ..., VI.2.4 *ūtī śá* ..., VI.14.1 *bhāsan nú śá* ..., VI.20.5 *urú śá* ..., VII.104.10 *ní śá* ..., VIII.20.16 *abhī śá* ..., IX.73.8 *trī śá* ..., IX.79.3 ... *arír hí śá*. But I.64.13 *prá nū śá* ..., without ruki.

VI.2.5: The two adjectives *vayāvantam* and *śatāyusam* are best taken as proleptic, with Ge and Re.

For extensive disc. of this vss., see comm. ad VI.2.4–5 above.

VI.2.6: Just as in VI.1.2 there is a nom. sg. masc. pres. part. *sán* without any obvious concessive value; unlike VI.1.2 there is no metrical explanation available. The close sandhi in the phrase *diví śán* might seem to give us a clue -- that the two words should be read as a constituent and are the equivalent of a circumstantial clause: constituency could account for the ruki. This is responsible for my tr. “when it is in heaven” (sim. Ge), instead of construing *diví* with *ātataḥ* like Re (“s’étendant au

ciel”). However, assembling the retroflexion data both for *sán/sát* in a ruki environment and for *diví* with following *s-* weakens this hypothesis. In the former case *sán/sád* generally doesn’t exhibit retroflexion; see III.9.2 *dūré sán*, IV.15.1 *vāṣṭ sán*, IV.27.1 *nú sán*, VIII.43.9 *gárbhe sán* (though the first and third phrases are constituents); V.44.3 *sacate sád*, VI.27.2 *máde sád + niṣádi sát + vividre sád*, X.129.1 *nó sád*. However, there is retroflexion in II.41.10 *abhî ṣád*; *ánti ṣád* IV.5.10, VIII.73.1 (though the two forms don’t form a syntactic constituent in any of these passages) and in IX.61.10 *diví ṣád* (almost exactly our phrase). In other words, the data are equivocal. On the other hand, the loc. *diví* regularly retroflexes the initial *s-* of forms of \sqrt{as} , as here: I.108.11 *diví ṣṭhó* [dual verb], V.2.10 *diví ṣantu*, V.60.6 *diví ṣṭhá*, VI.33.5 *diví ṣyāma*, and the just cited IX.61.10 (cf. also VI.52.13 *dyávi ṣṭha*), though it does not retroflex other initial *s-*s; cf. I.125.6 *diví sūryasya*, V.27.6 = V.85.2 *diví sūryam*, V.35.8 *diví stómam*, VIII.56.5 *diví sūryo*, X.75.3 *diví svanó*, X.85.1 *diví sómo*. It thus appears that the retroflexion of *ṣán* here is an automatic product of a rule that induces ruki in *s-*initial forms of the verb ‘to be’ after *diví* and does not give information -- or at least high-quality information -- about constituency. I have no idea why \sqrt{as} should exhibit this behavior; it cannot be due to (lack of) accent, since several of the ruki-ed forms are accented (including the one here).

VI.2.7: The 2nd hemistich presents some interpretational problems, generated by the standard assumption that *jūrya-* belongs to $\sqrt{jṛ}$ ‘be/get old’. Not only is the expression “delightful like an aged one in his stronghold” odd, but such interpr. require bleaching out the gerundive value of *jūrya-* (esp. unlikely given that it’s parallel to *trayayāyyah* in d and *īḍyah* in a). Cf., e.g., Ge’s “behaglich [cozy, snug] wie ein Greis in seiner Burg,” which also pushes *raṇvā-* into a meaning otherwise unknown to it. Re’s “joyeux, tel un vieil (homme) dans la forteresse” maintains the meaning of *raṇvā-*, but the connection between it and the simile seems strained. Old (ZDMG 55: 279 = KISch 738) cleverly suggests that there’s a crisscross word order, with the son of the simile in d appropriate to the adj. in c and vice versa: so something like (he doesn’t actually translate) “delightful like a son, to be protected like an old man in his stronghold.” But this is an ad hoc response to dissatisfaction with the apparent pragmatics of the passage.

These problems can be solved in twofold fashion. 1) I take *raṇvāḥ* as a pun, a word common to both similes. In both cases it applies to Agni, but in two different senses. 2) This reinterpretation is enabled by a different analysis of *jūrya-*. I take it to the root \sqrt{jvar} ‘burn, flame’, showing the same zero-grade as in *jūrṇí-* ‘firebrand’ (<*jvrH-C, with loss of -v- before \bar{u}/u , as in *urú-* < *vrH-u). I can see no possible formal objection to this analysis, despite the apparently universal insistence that *jūrya-* must belong to $\sqrt{jṛ}$.

Starting with these assumptions, we can take the two gerundives, *jūryah* in c and *trayayāyyah* in d, as the predicates of their respective pādas (as *īḍyah* is of pāda a). One of the drawbacks to the standard interpr. is that this syntactic parallelism is broken. In c the picture is of an battle-eager (warrior) (for a similar usage of *raṇvā-* see X.115.4 and remember that *rāṇa-* means both ‘joy’ and ‘battle’) who is to be

enflamed / set blazing; in the simile *jūrya-* is metaphorical, but of course the word is literally applicable to Agni the fire, who is the upameya. One minor problem with this interpr. is that the simile marker *iva* is in the wrong position: we would expect to find it after *raṇvā-*. But there are enough displaced simile markers in the RV that this positioning is not a major obstacle.

When applied to the simile in d, *raṇvā-* has its more usual meaning ‘delightful, bringing delight’, which is appropriate to the son and helps explain the desire to protect him. Here the publ. tr. adds “to the home” to “a son who brings delight.” I made this addition because I think there’s a buried pun. On the one hand, in c *raṇvāḥ purí* (“battle-lusty warrior in a fortress”) construes a locative with the subject (acdg. to my view of the constituency) and we might expect a similar loc. in the corresponding expression; on the other, *raṇvā-* in its meaning ‘delightful’ is often a descriptor of a home or construed with a loc. of ‘home’. Cf. I.69.4–5 *raṇvó duroṇé* “bringing joy to the house,” precisely of Agni. It may be that *pūrí* can be directly applied to the simile in d and in that context means ‘home’ -- though I doubt it: the RVic *pūr-* does not have domestic associations. Instead I think that *raṇvā-* in the “protected son” context evokes *duroṇé*, and this subsurface evocation is realized in the next verse by the phonologically similar loc. *dróṇe* ‘wood(en) cup’. The unexpected and unusual use of *dróṇa-* in that vs. (for which see comm. ad loc.) suggests that it may have been deployed there in order to play on the unexpressed (*)*duroṇé* here. This may seem overclever; in that case the tr. could stop short at “to be protected like a son who brings delight.” In any case, it would probably better to put “to the home” in parens.

A last comment on the hemistich: I have tr. cd in the opposite order, so that the domestic half (d) immediately adjoins the “dear guest” of b. This is not necessary, but given that my interpr. of c involves a radical rethinking of the standard view, it seemed best to make the new reading easier to assimilate.

The gerundive of d, *trayayāyā-*, is a hapax and a striking formation -- in the first instance, just because of the rhythmic rollout of -VyV- sequences. With regard to its derivation, as Debrunner points out (AiG II.2.285–86), it seems to pattern with -āyā- gerundives built to -āya-stems: *panayāyā-*, *mahayāyā-*, *sprhayāyā-*. However, there is no such verb stem **trayāya-*. Debrunner adds the parenthetical remark “von v. Präs. *trāya-*,” but of course in that case we should expect **trāyāyā-*. Both the short root vowel and the extra -ya- remain unexplained by that derivation. I have only the wispiest gestures towards an explanation. For $\sqrt{trā}$ we would probably expect an -āya-formation **trāpayā-*; however, it might have followed the model of $\sqrt{pā}$ and $\sqrt{pyā}$ with a -y-hiatus filler instead (*pāyāyati* and *pyāyāyati* [AV+] respectively), hence **trāyāyati*. We might then invoke the tendency of roots with the shape *CRā* to shorten their root vowel in the *p*-causative, type *jñāpayati* and, specifically with *Crā* root, *śrapāyati* (both AV+). For disc. see my 1983 monograph on the -āya-formations, pp. 208–11. So one might posit such a shortening to the differently formed causative to a *CRā* root **trayāyati*, which could serve as base for our *trayayāyā-* here (encouraged by the short root vowels of the -āya-stem -āyā-gerundives quoted above). But the chain of assumptions and unattested forms seems

too long, and we might instead just attribute *trayayāyā-* to a poet's whimsical multiplication of *-ya-*s -- his version of tra-la-la.

VI.2.8: The voc. *ágne* was omitted in the publ. tr. I would insert it after “purpose.”

Note that the first hemistich begins with *krátvā* and ends with *kṛtvāḥ*.

This vs. displays the same verbal intricacy as the immediately preceding vs. 7. As also in vs. 7 the first hemistich is less complex than the second, but that doesn't mean it lacks puzzles. The principal question is the root affiliation of *ajyāse*. With Ge I take it as a pun, as passive to both $\sqrt{aṇj}$ ‘anoint’ and \sqrt{aj} ‘drive’ (Old opts for \sqrt{aj} , Re for $\sqrt{aṇj}$). The primary connection is presumably to $\sqrt{aṇj}$: the ritual fire is “anointed” with the offering butter; cf. the nearby occurrences of the ppl. *aktá-* ‘anointed’ (VI.4.6, 5.6). But the loc. *dróṇe* casts a shadow on the clarity of this association. Though the stem *dróṇa-* is doubtless a deriv. of *dāru-/drú-* ‘wood’ (see EWA s.v.), it doesn't refer to wood as a general material, much less to firewood. It is specialized as the (wooden) cup for soma; the stem is mostly limited to the Soma Maṇḍala, but even in its two other occurrences in VI (37.2, 44.20) it refers to the soma cup. Therefore, if we want to take *dróṇe ajyāse* here to mean something like “(the fire located) on the (fire-)wood is anointed,” we must take *dróṇe* as a specialized stand-in for *vāne* or the like (see the passages assembled by Ge in n. 8a; cf. also *drusādvā* ‘sitting on the wood’ in the next hymn, VI.3.5), whose meaning has been twisted. This unusual substitution pushes us in two directions. On the one hand, if *dróṇe* here is meant to evoke *duroṇé* ‘at home’ in the previous vs. (7cd), we can explain its unusual employment here and the twisting of its referent from wooden cup to wood -- and even take it as gesturing to ‘home’ here as well, ‘home’ being Agni's fireplace as well as the home of the sacrificer. On the other hand, since the soma after its purification is regularly driven into its containers, we can take *ajyāse* also to \sqrt{aj} ‘drive’ and see the common identification of the two ritual substances, fire and soma, that pervades much of the RV. One of the characteristic ritual actions performed on Soma would here be attributed to Agni. The simile in b, *vājī ná* ‘like a prize-seeker’ works with either verb, since horses are both anointed and driven. Moreover, both *vājīn-* and *kṛtvya-* are regularly used of soma -- further strengthening the Agni/Soma connection sketched in pāda a.

The similes in the next two pādas cause further problems. In c the first question is the case of *svadhā*. Ge and Old favor nom., Re and I instr. If *svadhā* is nom., the series of similes with Agni as implicit subject and upameya is disrupted. The next issue is what is meant by a *párijmā ... gáyaḥ*. Both Ge and Re take it as some sort of mobile home (e.g., Ge “ein fahrender Hausstand”). Although in a pastoral society like that of the RV such a notion is not as comic as it might at first seem — and although fire is frequently depicted as burning across the land — I do not think that that is the image meant there. Note first that *gáya-* is several times associated with the preverb *pári* (esp. *pári* $\sqrt{pā}$ VI.71.3, X.66.3, though as an object not a subject, I have to admit). And from its literal sense ‘earth-encircling’, *párijman-* can develop the sense ‘encircling, encompassing’. That is the sense I see here, with the domestic deity Agni compared to the extended family that embraces

everything belonging to it -- a likely reference to the ritual fire as the joint possession and symbol of the Ārya clans.

The second simile depends on the meaning of *hvāryá-*. This stem must belong to the root \sqrt{hvr} 'go crookedly'. Ge thinks it refers to a bird, which has little to recommend it since there's already a horse in the passage; others (Re, Th [KISch 78]) to the meandering or zig-zag movement of the fire (e.g., Re "(il va) zigzaguant ..."). I prefer to take it as a gerundive (despite the accent, which is unusual for such a formation) and indeed one to an underlying causative. My further assumption is that the "young steed" of the simile is being trained, by being run in circles (around someone in the middle holding a rope attached to the horse -- a standard part of horse training today it seems from images and videos conjured up by Google -- and recall the Mitanni horse-training tablets with their numbers of 'turns' [*vartana*]). Although \sqrt{hvr} often refers to more random motion, it implicitly contrasts with motion in a straight line, which a circle is not. The advantages to this interpr. are 1) it would refer to something that the ritual fire actually does or is made to do: the Paryagnikaraṇa or the circling of the sacrificial animal (and associated paraphernalia) with a firebrand; 2) it would implicitly pick up *pārijmā* from the beginning of the hemistich, with a more literal sense of 'encircle, encompass' than in pāda c. If this latter suggestion is correct, as in 7cd the first word of pāda c, *pārijmā*, would be applicable to the similes in both c and d with slightly different senses, just like *raṇvāḥ* in 7c.

VI.2.9: With Ge, I supply the verb 'eat' in pāda a. Although Ge does not give his reasons, the existence of a parallel passage in this Agni cycle gives a clear warrant: VI.15.1 *jyók cid atti gárbho yád ácyutam* "For a long time the embryo eats just what is immovable." Re supplies a different verb in a from the one he supplies in b: "(tu ébranles) ... comme le bétail (dévore) ..." But this violates the structure of the RVic simile.

The problem in the 2nd hemistich is the form *dhāmā*. Gr, fld. by Lub, interprets it as a 1st pl. root aor. injunctive, but though a 1st person would work in some hymns, there seems to be no personal intrusion in this one -- nor can I figure out how a 1st pl. "we establish(ed)" would fit here. Both Ge and Re take it as a neut. pl. to *dhāman-* and therefore the subject of *vṛścānti*. However, this requires an interpr. of *dhāman-* -- Ge "Kräfte," Re "pouvoirs-d'état" (whatever that means) -- that I do not think is possible for this word, and, in any case, can "powers" hew? On the basis of VI.6.1 (also in this cycle) *vṛścādvana-* 'wood-hewing' (the compounded version of our *vānā vṛścānti*), which modifies Agni, I think that the subject of *vṛścānti* must be Agni, or rather some parts of Agni, since a plural is required. I therefore take *śikvasaḥ* as a nom. pl., not gen. sg. (with Ge, Re), referring to Agni's flames or his various embodiments. This leaves *dhāmā* stranded; I take it as an annunciatory main clause with *yád* as the definitional relative clause: "(this is your) principle, that ..." My tr. assumes a neut. singular *dhāmā*, allowed by Wackernagel (AiG III.272), Old (ZDMG 55: 280 = KISch 739), etc. It would also be possible to tr. as a plural: "(these are your) principles, that ..." A different possibility is enabled by Ge's suggested alternative tr. of *dhāmā* (n. 9c) as "Erscheinungsformen," which is more palatable

than his “Kräfte.” If we allow the meaning of *dhāman-* to stretch to this extent, we could tr. cd “when the forms of you, the dexterous one, hew the woods,” with *śikvasaḥ* a genitive with *te*. Nonetheless, I still prefer the publ. tr.

VI.2.10: I interpr pāda a (which is identical to IV.9.5a) as a variation on passages like X.2.2 *vēṣi hotrām utá potrām jánānām* “pursue the office of Hotar and of Potar of the peoples,” but with gapping of the terms for the priestly offices.

The standard tr. take *samṛdhāḥ* as an abstract ‘success’ (e.g., Ge “Schaff ... Gelingen”; cf. also Re, Scar [67]), but the only other occurrences of this root noun, in the frog hymn VII.103.5, clearly means something like ‘unison’, referring to the frog chorus. One of the two finite forms of this lexeme, *sám āṇṛdhe* in X.79.7, also seems to have this sense: Agni “comes together” with his parts or limbs (*pārvabhiḥ*). The other, in X.85.27, has a sense closer to simplex \sqrt{rdh} ‘be (completely) realized, come to success’. In our passage here, the ‘unison’ interpr. makes sense, esp. in the larger context of this hymns (and also VI.1), with the focus on Agni as clanlord of the separate Ārya clans, which are nonetheless working towards a common goal. On the other hand, the appearance of simplex *ṛdhat* in this hymn (4a, on which see comm. ad loc.) and in the cmpd. *ṛdhādvāra-* in the next (VI.3.2) might suggest a rendering closer to the simplex here as well.

VI.2.11: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. forms a slight ring with vs. 1, with voc. *mitramahaḥ* echoing *mitró ná* of 1b.

Both Ge and Re take *vīhí* as having a double acc., with *svastīm sukṣitīm* the secondary object expressing benefits we seek from the gods whom we pursue (e.g., Ge “Ersuche die Männer des Himmels um Glück, um gutes Wohnen.” But this seems unnecessary (and is not the usual syntax of $\sqrt{vī}$); the root $\sqrt{vī}$ takes a variety of objects, including concrete inanimates, as in VI.12.6 (in this cycle) *vēṣi rāyāḥ* “you pursue riches,” and here I see it as having both inanimate and animate objects.

Pāda d *dviṣó āṃhāṃsi duritā tarema* is a reprise of 4d *dviṣó āṃho ná tarati*.

VI.3 Agni

VI.3.1: The standard tr. take *te* with *jyótiḥ*, i.e., “your light.” Because of its somewhat unusual pāda-final position, however, I construe it rather with immediately preceding *devayúṣ* “seeking you as god.” The retroflexion in *devayúṣ te* might have been interpr. as an indication of constituency and therefore as support for my interpr., but this argument does not hold. For retroflexion of *te* after a rukified or -fiable -s, cf. I.11.6, 7 (I.131.4, IV.42.7) *vidúṣ te*, I.48.6 (I.69.7, VIII.24.17) *nákiṣ te*, I.104.1 (VII.24.1) *yóniṣ te*, IV.4.3 (VIII.71.8) *mākiṣ te*, IV.10.4 *ābhíṣ te*, V.38.1 *uróṣ te*, VI.44.11 (VIII.40.9) *pūrvīṣ te*, VII.3.4 *prásitiṣ te*, VII. 18.18 *rāradhúṣ te*, VIII.14.3 *dhenúṣ te*, VIII.17.6 *svādúṣ te*, VIII.44.23 *syúṣ te*, IX.104.4 *góbhiṣ te*, X.33.7 *pitúṣ te*, X.38.3 *asmābhiṣ te*, X.56.2 *taniṣ te*, X.85.40 *agníṣ te*, X.112.1 *ukthébhiṣ te*.

Counterexamples: I.80.8 *bāhvós te*, I.147.2 *vandārus te*, I.163.3 *āhús te*, III.55.22 *niṣṣídhvarīs te*, IV.12.1 *trís te*, IX.79.5 *āvis te*, IX.86.5 *prabhós te* [VII.99.7 *vāṣaṭ te*].

In other words, retroflexion is the most common outcome of *te* after a word ending with a ruki-fiable *s*, though it is not without exception. Constituency does not seem to play a role, nor (though this is not clear from the examples just assembled) does metrical position: all of the non-rukified examples occur first in their *pādas*, but rukified examples occur in every sort of metrical position, including, regularly, initial in *pāda*. See also the data on retroflexion discussed just above ad VI.2.6.

In the 2nd hemistich *āmhaḥ* is the most problematic form. In the syntagm *pāsi ... mārtaṁ āmhaḥ* we should like an ablatival reading: “you protect the mortal *from* narrow straits.” There are several ways to achieve this reading or to configure the form in a syntactically different way. For general disc. of this problem see Old, ZDMG 55: 280–81, and Schindler, Root noun, pp. 10–11. Gr (fld. by Kuiper III 1: 49 [1957]) invents a root noun *āmḥ-* for just this passage, beside the very well-attested *s*-stem *āmhas-*, to which our form could be the abl. Although this solves the immediate problem, inventing a stem for a single occasion otherwise has little to recommend it, and we should in any case expect accent on the ending, **āmháḥ*. Others take it as an abl. to the *s*-stem, truncated in some way and at some period. M. Hale (Fs. Melchert) sees it as an archaic zero-grade abl. to the *s*-stem, preserved from a pre-proto stage of IE -- though he otherwise sets forth quite cogently the arguments against positing the preservation of such archaisms. Wackernagel (AiG III.80) interprets it as a haplology from **āmhasaḥ*, an ad hoc solution that again solves the problem, but rather crudely. Schindler, flg. an oral suggestion of Hoffmann’s (in turn fld. by Scar 135, 300), takes it as the acc. it appears to be, governed by a participle to be supplied (he suggests *ā√r*, on the basis of V.31.13): “den Sterblichen, den du, O Gott, beschützt, wenn er durch Verlassenheit in Bedrängnis (gerät).” This again takes care of the form, but requires supplying material from nowhere.

I also am inclined to take it as an acc., but not via the same mechanism as Schindler (/Hoffmann), but by way of syntactic ambiguity plus metrical convenience. I start with the fact that 1) abl. *āmhasaḥ* is common with *√pā*, often final in a Jagatī cadence; in this cycle cf. VI.16.30, 31 (though these two are actually in dimeter cadences) ... *pāhy āmhasaḥ*#. 2) Another, semantically similar, expression involves *āmhas-* and (*vī*) *√muc* ‘release’, but this expression can have two different syntactic realizations: personal ACC. + ABL. of the danger, or ACC of danger + personal ABL. Cf., e.g., I.118.6 *āmuñcatam vārtikām āmhaso nīḥ* “you two released the quail from *āmhas-*” versus II.28.6 (etc.) *vatsād vī mumugdhy āmhaḥ* “release *āmhas-* from the calf.” The same duality of construction is found with *√pr* ‘carry across, rescue’. Cf. in the next hymn VI.4.8 *pārṣy āmhaḥ* “carry (us) across narrow straits” versus VII.16.10 *tān āmhasaḥ pipṛhi* “rescue them from narrow straits.” I suggest that here we have a blend of these constructions extended to semantically similar *√pā*. The person remains in the ACC., but the danger is put into the ACC. as well. The similarity of the expression here ... *pāsi ... āmhaḥ*# and, in the next hymn, VI.4.8 *pārṣi āmhaḥ*# may have contributed. And I don’t think we should discount metrical convenience: the expected abl. *āmhasaḥ* is fine for a Jagatī cadence but doesn’t fit a Triṣṭubh cadence like this one, whereas *āmhaḥ* is quite common in Triṣṭubh cadences.

So if the poet can find a syntactically principled way to use acc. *ámhaḥ* here, he will — and, in my opinion, he did. Note also *ámho mártam* in the next vs. (2d), the same words in opposite order to our *mártam ámhaḥ*, as well as *ámhaḥ* in the previous hymn, VI.2.4.

A less pressing problem is how to construe the instr. *tyájasā*. In the Hoffmann/Schindler interpr., it is simply construed with the invented participle: “wenn er durch Verlassenheit in Bedrängnis (gerät).” Both Ge and Re take it as the cause leading to *ámhaḥ*, e.g., Ge “... vor Not infolge einer Unterlassungssünde,” but Ge suggests in a n. (1) that it could be an instr. of accompaniment with *ámhaḥ* (“vor Not und Sünde”). That is the tack I adopt here, but I consider *tyájas-* as something that might befall the hapless mortal rather than something he might commit (like Sünde) and bring about his bad fortune. On the semantics of *tyájas-* here and elsewhere in the RV, see Old, ZDMG 55.280–82.

VI.3.2: As Ge points out, pāda a recalls VI.1.9a with *īje śaśamé* as here; the addition of *ṛdhát-* in pāda b also recalls VI.2.4a *ṛdhat ... śaśámate*. In fact, the diction of the first hymns in this Agni cycle is very similar; cf. e.g., the repetition of *ámhas-* (VI.2.3, 11; 3.1.2, 4.8), the use of the verb \sqrt{nas} (*ānaṭ* VI.1.9, *aśyām* VI.1.13, *naśat* 2.5, *naśate* 3.1, 2, *aśyāma* 4x 5.7), etc. Other echoes have been treated elsewhere in the comm. The two forms of *naśate* in these first two vss. express mirror images: the first (1b) has the virtuous mortal as subject, suitably rewarded by attaining the light; the 2nd (2d) has the same mortal as object, with the verb negated, to express the evils that will not reach the mortal.

VI.3.3: This vs., esp. its 2nd half, bristles with difficulties and has been interpr. in an exhausting variety of ways (not only the usual tr., but also, e.g., Old at length in ZDMG 55.283–84=KlSch 742–43; Thieme Unters.; Lüders, AcOr 13 [=Phil.Ind.]; Scar 146–47; Gonda, Ved.Lit. 219). I will not treat these other interpr. in detail, but merely lay out my own, which is in closest agreement with Lüders (“Ved. heřant-...,” Philol. Ind.: 781ff.) through the first half of c. The general point of the vs. seems to be, as often, to contrast the fearsome and militant aspects of Agni with his benign ones.

It might also be pointed out that pāda a, which is the most straightforward part of the vs., has a bad cadence that is not easily fixable; in fact it presents an unusual sequence of 5 light syllables: (*sūro ná yá*)*sya dṛśatír a(repā)*. I do not see any way to make *-tír* heavy.

The first question, in the relatively transparent 1st hemistich, is what *bhīmā* modifies. Though Ge and Re take it with *dṛśatīḥ* -- that is, Agni’s appearance is both spotless (*arepā*) and fearsome -- the pāda boundary weakly suggests that *bhīmā* should be construed with the other fem., namely *dhīḥ*. On the assumption that this *dhī-* is Agni’s, *bhīmā* identifies the *dhī-* with the violent side of Agni.

In c, with Ge and Lü inter alia, I assume that a new clause begins with *nāyām* and, also with Lü, that *heřasvant-* means ‘possessing arms, armed’. The opening of this pāda *heřasvataḥ śurúdhāḥ* then is a nominal clause, with the gen. *heřasvataḥ*

expressing possession. Cf. III.38.5 *imā asya śurūdhaḥ santi pūrvīḥ* “here are his many proliferating riches”; sim. IV.23.8 *ṛtasya hī śurūdhaḥ sānti pūrvīḥ* “Of truth there exist many riches.” The rich spoils that fall to Agni are presumably the various materials he burns.

The published tr. importantly omits *aktóḥ*. It should be corrected to “(But) on his own, by night, this one here ...” This temporal adverb implicit contrasts with *sūro ná* of pāda a. That is, the appearance of the militant Agni is compared to the sun, the light of day, whereas the benign Agni described in the second half of c + d is a phenomenon of night.

On the famous crux *nāyám* see comm. ad VIII.2.28 and my 2013 Fs. Hock article. *Pace* Thieme (1949: 51–52) and Lub, who classifies this passage separately, I believe that *nāyám* here belongs with the other occurrences of this syntagm.

The adj. *raṇvá-* recurs here from VI.2.7. On its indirect association with ‘home, dwelling’ in that passage and its direct associations elsewhere, see comm. ad loc. Here it might be better to render the phrase *raṇvó vasatīḥ* as “delightful dwelling” rather than “cozy nest” to bring out the echoes with the passage in the previous hymn.

I take *kútrā cid* as temporal rather than spatial.

VI.3.4: This vs. continues with the description of violent Agni.

Pāda d has caesura after 3; there are two other exx. of this metrical irregularity in the hymn, 6b and 8b, both of which have bad cadences as well. Here the early caesura might be calling attention to the extreme alliteration of the pāda: *dravír ná drāvayati dāru dhákṣat*. The same is not true of the others.

The hapax *yamasānā-*, an apparent participle to a supposed “Doppelstamm” to \sqrt{yam} , does not fit the pattern of most of the other *-asānā-* stems, on which see comm. ad IV.3.6 -- in that it neither falls into the semantic sphere of violent activity nor has an associated *s*-stem. Note here, however, that *rabhasānā-*, which meets both criteria, is found in the last vs. of this hymn (8d) and could have provided a model for this formation. I also wonder if *yamasānā-* is not a pseudo-cmpd. of *yāma-* ‘bridle’ (e.g., V.61.2) and $\sqrt{sā}$ ‘bind’, as if with a middle part. of the root aor. *asāt*, etc. (*viṣāṇa-* in V.44.1, identified as a part. by Gr., is better taken as an *-ana-* nom. to the same root; cf. AiG II.2.193). Hence, ‘being bound to the bridle’. Needless to say, this would not be well formed by standard Vedic compounding rules, but is not completely out of the question as a nonce inspired by *rabhasānā-*, itself a nonce. Note also the phonological figure (*yam*)*asānā āsā*.

The simile in c, *vijéhamānaḥ paraśúr ná jihvām*, has been variously interpr. I take the frame to be (*agnīḥ*) ... *jihvām* -- that is, the tongue is Agni’s, as usual, and refers to his flame(s). As for the comparandum, the ax -- I assume that *its* tongue is its blade, extending from the handle as a tongue does from a mouth. The blade might be found in the next vs. in *dhārā* (5b). See VI.2.7–8, where I argue that a word missing from vs. 7 is found or gestured toward in the following vs.

The hapax *dravīḥ* in the next pāda is universally taken as a nom. sg. masc. to an *i*-stem *dravī-* meaning ‘smelter’ (so Gr, etc., and cf. AiG II.2.297) or ‘cutter’ (so Hoffmann, Aufs. 420, to $\sqrt{drū}$ ‘cut’, rather than \sqrt{dru} ‘run’). But agent nouns in

simple *-í-*, though they do exist (see AiG II.2.296–97), are not exactly thick upon the ground. I suggest instead that it is a neut. *-ís-* stem like *havís-* ‘oblation’, *sarpís-* ‘melted butter’ (on this type, including those built to aniṭ roots, see AiG II.2.364–67). It would then be a cognate object to *drāvayati* in the simile and, on the one hand, be a more likely substance to be caused to run than wood (*dāru*) and, on the other, refer to the parts of wood that really do ‘run’, like sap. It might be worth noting that the much later cvi formation *dravī-bhū* (etc.) means ‘become liquid, liquefy’. (This of course has nothing to do with the *-í-* in *dravīh*, but does show that ‘run’ is used of liquids, a reasonably widespread semantic extension -- e.g., in English.)

The standard tr. take *dāru* as the obj. of *dhákṣat* ‘burning’, rather than of *drāvayati*. This is, of course, the safer course. But cf. V.41.10 *ní riṇāti vānā* “he liquefies the trees” (also of Agni), V.58.6 *riṇaté vānāni* “the trees dissolve,” both with the root \sqrt{ri} ‘flow’.

VI.3.5: This vs. is comparatively straightforward, esp. the first hemistich.

I take *tējah* in its literal etymological value: ‘sharpness’ → ‘point’, given *tigmá-* ‘sharp’ in 4a.

In c note the phonetic play of (*citrádh*)*rajatir aratír*.

Despite the pāda boundary, I take *vér ná* as the simile with both c and d, unlike most, who limit it to d. The root \sqrt{dhraj} ‘swoop, soar’ (found in the b.v. *citrá-dhrajati-*) is generally limited to birds (cf. I.165.2, IV.40.3) and the wind, and so comparison to a bird here would be apt. Note also that a form of \sqrt{dhraj} and an uncompounded form of *pátman-* are found together in 7c.

Though most interpr. take *aktóh* as a gen. either with *aratíh*, imposing a forced reading on the latter (Ge “der Lenker der Nacht,” Lü [Philol.Ind. 783] “als Herr der Nacht”), or with a gapped “Agni” (Th [Unters.] “der (Agni) des Nachts”), I think it likely that it is adverbial, as it is two vss. earlier (3c) in the same metrical position. So also Re.

Our *druṣádvan-*, a hapax, exists beside 2 occurrences of the simple root noun cmpd. *druṣád-* -- one of which is in an exactly parallel context: IX.72.5 *#vér ná druṣád* (like our *#vér ná druṣádvā*). I assume that the extension by the derivational suffix *-van-* simply serves metrical convenience, since the forms seem identical semantically. Several other *-sád-* cmpds have the same extension: *nrṣádvan-* (1x), *pariṣádvan-* (1x), and *admasádvan-*, found once in the very next hymn (VI.4.4), and *-van-* extensions are not rare in root noun cmpds, esp. to roots ending in *-ā*, such as *vājadāvan-* ‘giving prizes’, *sahasradāvan-* ‘giving thousands’, etc.

The final word of the vs., the b.v. *raghu-pátma-jamhāh*, is unusual for the RV in having three full members, as Re notes. He discusses the cmpd at some length and considers it a “conglomérat” of a tatpuruṣa **raghu-pátman-* (entirely parallel to *raghu-pátvan-*) and the attested bahuvrīhi *kṛṣṇá-jamhas-*, tr. “(dieu) au vol rapide, au plumage (noir)” (I.141.7). I see no reason to involve the latter cmpd., detach the (compounded) first member *raghu-pátman-* from the second, *jámhas-*, and insert a ‘black’ not found in the text to qualify the second member. The English designation “flight feathers” would have the same structure (save for the bahuvrīhi) as

raghupátma-jamhas-, that is, “feathers suitable/specialized for flight.” Note that in this bahuvrīhi with a cmpd first member, “first member accent” actually falls on the second member of the first cmpd., matching that of the original tatpuruṣa (cf. just cited *raghu-pátvan-*) -- in other words, when the bahuvrīhi is formed, the internal structure of its first member is no longer visible to the process.

VI.3.6: The noun *rebhá-* is generally tr. ‘singer’ and the root \sqrt{ribh} from which it is derived, ‘sing’. However, as I discussed in “On Translating the Rig Veda” (2000, Proceedings of UCLA IE conf.) and again in the Intro. to the publ. tr. (p. 78), the limited number of attestations of the verbal root and the variety of contexts in which it is found suggest that its meaning is more specific than ‘sing’. That the sound of \sqrt{ribh} can be compared to that made by birds of prey (IX.97.57) or by ungreated wood on a wagon (TS VII.1.1.3) suggests something on the lines of ‘squawk, squeak, rasp’ -- a hoarse or husky voice quality that would perhaps not be surprising in a middle-aged man in antiquity. The verb with which *rebháḥ* is construed in this passage, *rārapīti*, is likewise usually rendered in very general fashion, as ‘speak, praise’ or the like. But again it seems to have a more specific sense: ‘mutter, murmur’ vel sim. (see EWA and, e.g., Schaefer, Intens., both s.v. *rap*). So the anodyne tr. of Ge “Wie ein Bard ruft er ... laut” and Re “comme un barde ... il parle-puissamment” (both ascribing real intensive sense to *rārapīti* rather than the more likely frequentative) can be replaced with something both more pointed and more appropriate to Agni, who is the referent here: “like a hoarse-voiced (singer) he keeps muttering (=crackling) with his flame.”

The phrase *prāti vasta usrāḥ* should be read with accented *vásta*, an old correction, endorsed by Oldenberg inter alia. Cf. pāda-final *vásta usrāḥ* at IV.25.2, VII.69.5, VIII.46.26. The erasure of accent here may be redactional, based on the verb *vaste* in the next hymn, VI.4.3b. It should be noted, however, that Re interpr. *vasta* as a finite verb form to \sqrt{vas} ‘wear’ (“Comme un barde, il se revêt des aurores”), and he is followed by Lub. That the exact phrase, but with accent, occurs 3x elsewhere makes this interpr. unlikely. There remains, however, the question of what the underlying form is. The Pp analyzes it as *vaste*, but Old prefers -o (both here and for the other occurrences of the phrase), a loc. to *vástu-*. On -o (from -au) as *u*-stem loc., see AiG III.153–54.

Although *prāti* is not found in the other 3 exx. of the phrase, *prāti vástor* with genitive is attested in II.39.3, IV.45.5, X.189.3, so it is likely to form part of the phrase here. Given its position, it would be difficult to take it as a preverb with *rārapīti*, esp. since \sqrt{rap} isn’t otherwise construed with *prāti*; see comm. ad V.61.9.

As noted previously, pāda b is metrically bad, with caesura after 3 and a bad cadence *mitrámahāḥ*, where we should have a heavy penult.

The *īm* in Wackernagel’s position in pāda a is, in my opinion, a long-distance anticipation of the *īm* in c, and both are placeholders for *nṛ̥n* at the end of c and d. This might be clearer if the publ. tr. read “he keeps muttering to them.”

The second hemistich consists of a pair of parallel relative clauses with no overt verb. It also, quite unusually, shows verbatim repetition after the caesura: x x x

x / *aruṣó yó divā nṛn*. Such tag repetitions are far more characteristic of short echo pādas in meters like Atyaṣṭi, and even in those meters there tends to be some patterned variation. I don't know what function this repetition serves here. I would attribute it to the poet's flagging imagination, except the rest of the hymn bursts with imagination.

There have been various solutions to the lack of verb in these relative clauses. Old, fld. by Re, supplies 'protects' ($\sqrt{pā}$). There's nothing wrong with this -- it provides a verb to govern acc. pl. *nṛn*, and "protect men" is a relatively common predicate, as Old points out. But there's nothing in the context that imposes this addition; the closest we can come is *pāsi* in 1d. Ge takes these as nominal clauses -- "der bei Nacht, der am Tage das rötliche (Ross) der Männer ist" -- which saves him from supplying an unmotivated verb, but requires *nṛn* to be a gen. pl., which I think we should avoid if at all possible. The simplest solution, at least as far as I can see, is simply to continue the verb of the first hemistich, *rārapīti*. The *īm* of 6a, echoed by *īm* in c, may suggest that the clauses follow the same template, and as noted above, *īm* in 6a is easiest to explain if it anticipates *nṛn* in the relative clauses. Needless to say, when a verb needs to be supplied in the RV, a silent iteration of a verb in a previous nearby pāda or verse is often the best choice. And in this case the intensive (=frequentative) form of *rārapīti* in b may be reflected iconically in the implied repetition of Agni's muttering in the rest of the verb. The next two vss. provide some further support for this suggestion. In 7ab an intensive in the relative clause of pāda is matched by an intensive to the same root in pāda b, and in 8a supplying an intensive in the rel. cl. to match the one in the main clause of b also makes sense. Although I still think the 2nd half of this vs. is clumsy, it may be clumsy apurpose.

VI.3.7: More or less with Ge (fld. also by Re), I supply a word for sound or noise as the subj. of pāda a; see Ge's parallels cited in his n. 7a. They opt for 'voice', while I favor something generated from the two verbs in this hemistich, both derived from \sqrt{nu} 'roar', e.g., *nāvā-* 'roar(ing)'.

The two verbs themselves require comment, *nāvīnot* and *nūnot*, both pāda-final. First, note that the accent on the first but not the second requires that pāda b must be the main clause to pāda a. The stems of the two verbs are similar but not identical; both have heavy or intensive redupl. and appear to mean pretty much the same thing. *nāvīnot* is clearly an intensive to \sqrt{nu} (or $\sqrt{nū}$? see EWA s.v.); the stem is attested once elsewhere in the RV (VII.87.2), though the better-attested intens. stem is *ánono/u-*. The other verb *nūnot*, which is also attested once elsewhere (V.45.7), is less clear morphologically. Wh classifies it as a redupl. aor., and Schaeffer (Intens. p. 147) also attempts to argue for this identification. There are two problems with taking it as a redupl. aor. First, there is no causative attested to this root — *nāvayati* is only lexical — but a redupl. aor. of this shape should be secondarily generated to a causative. Second, a redupl. aor. should have transitive/causative value, but neither occurrence of *nūnot* has this sense, and in our passage it is difficult to see how to construct such a contrastive value for *nūnot* in opposition to *nāvīnot*. They seem to be used in identical fashion. Schaeffer in fact

does try to claim that *nūnot* has factitive-transitive value, translating *nāvīnot* as “brüllt” and *nūnot* as “Gebrüll erregt.” But “Gebrüll erregt” is a translational sleight of hand -- simply a phrasal paraphrase of “brüllt,” enabled by German (similarly in English “shouted” / “raised a shout”). There is no acc. obj. in the Skt.; the noun “Gebrüll” is a dummy noun. I therefore think we should take them both as intensives with the same meaning. I do not understand the reduplication vowel of *nūnot*; metrically **nonot* would have been equivalent and could belong to the better attested intensive stem cited above -- though it should be noted that the attested 3rd sg. to that stem is a (pseudo?) set *nónavīti*, so the secondary form might be expected to be **nonavīt*. All of this is made more complicated by the metrical irregularity of *pāda* b, which has only 10 syllables. However, (*oṣa*)*dhīṣu nūnot* provides a fine cadence to this line, while repeating *navīnot* from *pāda* a would yield enough syllables but a bad cadence, (*oṣadhī*)*ṣu navīnot*, and the hypothetical **nonavīt* would also produce a bad cadence.

rukṣá- is a hapax. It is generally taken as a nom. sg. *-as* out of sandhi with a meaning ‘shining’, derived from \sqrt{ruc} . So Gr, Ge, EWA s.v., etc. This is perfectly possible, harmless, and not very interesting. I favor the more daring hypothesis: that it is a loc. in *-e* out of sandhi and belongs to a **rukṣá-* ‘tree’, found also in the widespread MIA *rukkha-* ‘tree’ (Pāli, Pkts.), which is probably a metathesis of *vrkṣá-* ‘id.’ (see EWA s.v. *vrkṣá-*). So also Re. In this context it could be indirectly alluding to its source by its position after *vṛṣā*, which is phonologically close to *vrkṣá-*.

The second hemistich presents its own difficulties. A crucial problem is the apparent lack of a verb. Ge and Re supply ‘fill’ (e.g., “Himmel und Erde mit Gut (erfüllt)”). I follow Old’s suggestion (ZDMG 55.290=KlSch 749; not very enthusiastically alluded to in the Noten) that we should emend *dám* in d to *tán* (root aor. injunctive to $\tilde{a}\sqrt{tan}$ ‘stretch’). As he points out, this lexeme with *ródasī* (vel sim.) as object/goal, often Agni as subject, and an instr. is quite common, esp. in this set of hymns (VI.1.11, 4.6, 6.6 [recall how tight the phraseology is in this Agni cycle]); cf., e.g., $\tilde{a} yás tatántha ródasī ví bhāsā$. Although I strenuously resist emendation ordinarily, the echo of IV.19.7 *dám̐supatnīḥ* might have led to the change here. (On that form see comm. ad loc.) In any case, *pace* the Pp. (see also Lubotsky s.v. *dám-*), I think it unlikely that the sequence contains the accented monosyllable *dám̐* followed by an accented *supátñīḥ*. Inter alia, the root noun *dám-* outside of the cmpd *dámpati-* and esp. the archaic gen. *dán* in the phrase *pátir dan* are confined to Maṇḍalas I and X. If the emendation of *dám̐* to **tán* seems too radical (and I’m inclined now to think it is), I would read **dám̐supatnīḥ* with one accent, supply a verb, and tr. “... (fills) with goods the two worlds, who (thus) have (in him) a wondrous husband.”

In c I take the participle *yán* with both the simile and the frame.

Note the return of \sqrt{dhraj} (*dhṛájasā*) and *pátman* (*pátmanā*) from 5cd.

VI.3.8: The vs. is structured as two *vā* alternatives; the reason for this is unclear. See Klein II.203–4.

The rel. cl. of pāda a has no verb, and the verb of b, *dauidyot*, must belong to a main clause because of its lack of accent. Ge, Re, and Klein (II.203–4) supply “become strengthened”; this certainly makes sense, but there is nothing in context or parallel passages that encourages this invention. Kü (206) goes for a more restrained “versehen ist,” a nominal clause with predicative instrumentals, I suppose. But given the twin rel. cl./main cl. intensives in 7ab (*nāvīnot* ... *nūnot*) and the intens. *dauidyot* in 8b, I wonder if the same pattern holds here, and we should supply an intens. form of $\sqrt{\text{dyut}}$ in a.

The *arkā-* of pāda a are most likely both chants and rays.

Pāda b is once again metrically irregular: it has a caesura after 3 and its cadence consists of 4 heavy syllables (*s''vebhiḥ śúsmaiḥ*).

VI.4 Agni

VI.4.1: As Re also points out, the *yáthā* ... *evá* framework of this vs. and the *adyá* and the *-si-impv. yakṣi* in the *evá* clause lead us to expect a preterite in the *yáthā* clause: “as you *have sacrificed (in the past) ..., so sacrifice today.” Encountering the pres. subj. *yájāsi* instead is surprising. Re operates with his usual parentheses to introduce the preterite: “S’il est vrai que (tu as sacrifié et) sacrifieras ...” I have inserted the totalizing qualifier “always” (“regularly” vel sim. would also work) to enable the future sense that I generally see in the subjunctive. Taking the subjunctive in a more modal fashion (“should sacrifice”) or, à la Tichy, as expectative (“Just as [I expect] you to sacrifice ...”) would be less troublesome in this passage, but I am reluctant to allow context to dictate function to that extent. I should note that Tichy does not treat this passage in her subjunctive monograph. IH suggests that the subjunctive here may show generalizing value, as in Greek, spread from indefinite contexts (“whoever [will] do X ...,” as in VI.5.4-5 ... *yáh* ... *dádāsat* / *sá* ... “whoever will ritually serve, he ...”).

VI.4.2: Ge takes both *vibhāvā* and *cakṣāṇiḥ* as transitive: “Er ist unser Erleuchter wie der Erheller am Morgen.” But well-attested *vibhāvan-* does not elsewhere take an object or an objective gen. (on X.8.4 see comm. ad loc. [once it exists]). By contrast, *cakṣāṇi-* is a hapax and so its value is more up-in-the-air. AiG II.2.207 takes it as an agent noun ‘Erheller’ and explains it (p. 208) as a nominalization of an infinitive in *-āni*; in our passage *cakṣāṇir ná* “als Anzeiger” is said to rest on **cakṣāṇi ná* “wie um anzuzeigen.” But this is not how RVic similes work, and further a class of *-āni* infinitives is marginal at best (see most recently Keydana, *Infinitive im Rgveda* pp. 190–96). I take it as an intrans. ‘sighting, vision’ -- AiG II.2.207 lists action nouns as one of the two standard values for *-ani*-nominals -- to harmonize in sense with *vibhāvā*, though other interpr. are not excluded. Old suggests ‘Beschauer’, sim. Re.

The tr. of *védya-* is in accord with my usual interpr. of this stem as ‘to be acquired’ (see comm. ad II.2.3) and my understanding of the original meaning of the epithet *jātávedas-* (in d here) as ‘having (all) beings as possessions’. However, ‘to be known’, found in the standard tr., would certainly be possible here.

Note that the phrasal verb *cāno √dhā* ‘take delight’ takes an acc. obj. *vandāru*, as is standard.

In the 2nd hemistich it is uncertain (but not terribly important) which of the nominatives is the predicate with *bhūt*. It is more difficult to attribute the usual change of state sense ‘become/became’ to *bhūt*; Hoffmann’s interpretation (p. 136) as a general statement about Agni seems reasonable. Indeed, I might be tempted to emend my ‘has been’ to ‘is’, to match the presential injunctive *cāno dhāt* in the preceding hemistich. The presence of this unnecessary *bhūt* may well be accounted for by the figure in which it participates: *uṣarbhūd bhūd*, which pleasingly has near rhyme forms from two different roots.

The collocation *uṣarbhūd- ātithi-* recurs in VI.15.1.

VI.4.3: The first hemistich treats the billowing smoke and bright flames of physical fire. The kernel of the first pāda, ... *yāsya panáyanti ábhvam*, is almost identical to II.4.5 *ā yān me ábhvaṃ vanádaḥ pánanta* “The formless mass [=smoke] of the woodeater which they (first) marvelled at.” Cf. comm. ad loc. In that verse also the next step for Agni is to become bright. In our vs. I supply ‘mortals’ from 2c as subj. of *panáyanta*, but undefined ‘they’ is also possible.

The problem in pāda a is *dyāvo ná*. We might like this to be genitive sg., allowing it to be parallel to *yāsya* and depend on *ábhvam*: “whose formless mass they marvel at like that *of heaven.” But there is no way that *dyāvaḥ* can be a genitive, and in any case it is also not at all clear that heaven is shaped like a formless mass. Old (ZDMG 55.291 = KISch 750) attempts to rescue this interpr. by assuming anacoluthon and mixture between the two constructions “Agni has *ábhvam* like the heavens” and “they admire A’s *ábhvam*,” but besides being overtricky, in both instances ‘heaven’ should be genitive, since Skt. lacks a ‘have’ verb and uses GEN X for such values. (He does not push this interpr. in the Noten.) Taking *dyāvaḥ* as the nom. pl. it must be, Ge and Re assume that *dyāvaḥ ná* belongs with the second pāda, as a simile with the verb *vaste* -- so Ge “Er ... kleidet sich wie die Himmel in Glanz.” Although this makes sense, it is syntactically impossible, at least as far as I can see: it requires fronting the simile around the entire relative clause, a major violation of standard RVic syntax. My own interpr. takes both the morphology and the syntax seriously: given the structure of the pāda, nom. pl. *dyāvaḥ* should be being compared to the subject of *panáyanti*. In fact, this is possible semantically as well: the heavens can marvel at Agni’s smoke that is billowing all the way up there. As often, assuming what the meaning of a RVic passage should be has led interpreters to distort the grammar to get to that meaning and has prevented them from reflecting on what the poet meant in producing a non-hackneyed image.

The 2nd hemistich presents its own problems, primarily because of missing or unspecified arguments to the verb. In c *ví ... inóti* lacks an overt object. Ge supplies “Schätze” and interprets the phrase in positive fashion. He reasonably cites as parallels, both from the immediately following hymn, VI.5.3 ... *inoṣi ... vāsūni* and VI.5.1 ... *invati dráviṇāni* with ‘goods’ and ‘chattels, treasures’ as obj. respectively. But these passages lack the preverb: although Gr lists VI.5.3 with *ví* as preverb, and

Ge apparently follows him, *ví* in that passage should be construed otherwise, not as a preverb with *inoṣi*; see comm. ad loc. In my opinion a more telling parallel is found in VI.10.7, also in this Agni cycle, with the *ví*: *ví dvéṣāṃsīnuhí* “dispel hatreds.” Re also considers the expression to be negative, on the basis of the same parallel, and tr. “lui qui chasse au loin (les ennemis).” The preverb *ví* is not found elsewhere with this verb. IH now makes the attractive sugg. that the obj. is actually the ‘smoke’ implied in the first hemistich. I consider this an alternative possibility.

In d the verb *śíśnathat* is construed with an acc. *pūrvyāṇi*, but the referent of this generic adj. ‘primordial’ is not clear. Other occurrences of both of these words (*śśnath* and *pūrvyā-*) don’t give clear formulaic guidance for what to supply as the real obj. This pāda is identical to II.20.5, an Indra hymn, and it does seem imported from an Indraic context here. (Bloomfield does not comment in RVReps.) Ge supplies Burgen (with ?) here, but Werke in II.20.5. Although the former works fine semantically, *pūr-* ‘fortress’ is fem. and so is excluded. Re supplies “performances”; he does not indicate what Sanskrit word he had in mind or why he thought it was apposite. Though it is the case that both *kṛtāni* and *kārmāṇi* appear with *pūrvyā(ṇi)*, I do not see how one can ‘pierce’ them. I supply ‘domains’ (*dhāmāni*), on the basis of IV.55.2 *dhāmāni pūrvyāṇi*, VIII.41.10 *dhāma pūrvyām*, although not with a great deal of confidence.

Ge and Re take *ásna-* as a PN, but I see no reason not to take it, with Gr, as a straightforward derivative of *śas* ‘eat’. Mayr splits the difference in his PN book, listing it as a PN but noting its likely original identity with the adj. *ásna-* ‘hungry’.

VI.4.4: The rare word *vadmán-* is found only here and in VI.13.6, also belonging to this cycle. It presumably presupposes a neut. **vādman-* ‘speech’, from which *vadmán-* was derived by accent shift, like neut. *bráhman-* → adj. *brahmán-*. *vadmā* here participates in a phonetic figure with pāda-final *admasádvā*, where both the 1st cmpd member *adma* and the 2nd *sádvā* match the basic phonological structure of *vadmā*.

The immediate context in VI.13.6 is similar, *vadmā sūno sahaso no víhāyā*, but it contains the full voc. phrase *sūno sahasaḥ* “o son of strength,” rather than the truncated *sūno* here (the only place in which the bare voc. *sūno* is found in the RV). The phrase “son of strength” is hypercharacteristic of this Agni cycle: besides VI.13.6 the full voc. is found in the 1st vs. of this hymn (1b), as well as nearby VI.1.10, 5.5, 11.6, 13.4–6, and 15.3, and the acc. *sūnúṃ sáhasaḥ* in VI.5.1, 6.1, the nom. in VI.12.1. This density of occurrence alone would strongly suggest that gen. *sahasah* has been gapped here, but I wonder if a factor contributing to the omission of *sahasah* is the two occurrences of *ūrj-* ‘strengthening nourishment’ in pāda c, given the similar, common voc. phrase *ūrjo napāt* “o descendent of nourishment” (e.g., in this cycle VI.16.25). The *ūrj-* forms would, as it were, substitute for *sáhas-* in this stereotyped “son/descendent of X” expression.

It is difficult to contrive a causal sense for *hí* here, and the particle is therefore not rendered in the publ. tr.

The meter of pāda c is problematic. HvN make the obvious distraction *tu vá m*, which produces an orthodox opening of 4, but a bad cadence. Old (both ZDMG 55.291 and Noten) suggests not distracting *tvám*, which produces an opening *sá tvám na ūrja-*, with caesura in the middle of the cmpd *ūrja-sane*, and reading *ūrjam* trisyllabic (with a medial rest: *ūrj am*). Although I usually pay heed to Old's metrical observations, this requires two highly unusual features: the caesura splitting the type of cmpd that is seldom split and a reading of *ūrjam* that is unprecedented in the occurrences of this stem, while failing to distract *tvám*, which is more often disyllabic than not. In this instance Old's usual good sense seems to have deserted him, and the HvN reading seems preferable. Part of the bad cadence may be attributable to following a phrasal template: pāda-final *ūrjam dhā(h)* has the same structure as pāda-final *cāno dhāt* in 2b. However, the light final preceding it (*ūrjasana ūrjam dhā(h)*) is harder to explain; of course the *-a* represents voc. *-e* in sandhi and perhaps we can unusually restore it.

VI.4.5: The first half of this vs. is fairly straightforward; the second bristles with nearly insoluble difficulties.

The adverbial *nítikti* 'sharply' presumably refers to haste -- as in Engl. "look sharp!" meaning "hurry!" Alternatively it could refer to the shape of flames, with their apparent sharp edges.

In b *rāṣṭrī* is somewhat surprising, whether it is applied to *vāyúh* 'wind' (so Ge) or to Agni (publ. tr.), since it is fem. and both of those are masc. (*pace* Debrunner, who suggests, implausibly, in AiG II.2.407 that *vāyú-* might in this passage be "ausnahmsweise Fem."). Gr simply lists this occurrence as a separate stem *rāṣṭrī* masc., next to the same stem identified as fem. It unfortunately cannot be the nom. sg. of an *-in*-stem 'possessing a kingdom (*rāṣṭrá-*)' because it should then be accented **rāṣṭrī*. This *-ī*-stem occurs twice elsewhere referring to Vāc and therefore is clearly fem., as we would expect. In our passage I think it has been employed as an imperfect pun with (unexpressed) *rātrī-* 'night' to evoke that stem in this passage concerning Agni's dominance of the nights (*aktūn*), here expressed by a distinct stem *aktú-*.

The image is that of a triumphant king marching across territory. Cf. the similar sentiment in VI.9.1, again part of this Agni cycle, ... *ná rājā / ávātiraj jyótiṣāgnís támāṃsi* "(Agni) like a king suppressed the dark shades with his light" and IV.4.1 (also of Agni) *yāhí rājeva ámavāṃś íbhena* "Drive like an aggressive king with his entourage." The relevance of the wind is unclear to me, except perhaps to indicate the speed of Agni's progress.

As noted above, the 2nd hemistich is a mess. So Old (ZDMG 55.291–92) "Der dritte Pāda ist schwierig und ein s i c h e r e s Resultat wohl unerreichbar." Interpr. therefore differ significantly, and I cannot treat the details of all. As already noted by Old, some help is given by semi-parallel passages containing $\sqrt{tṛ} + \acute{arātīḥ}$: IX.96.15 *átyo ná vājī tārātīd árátiḥ* "(he,) like a prize-winning steed, outstrips hostilities" (also with a horse in the simile, as here); III.24.1 *duṣṭáras tārann árátiḥ* "hard to overcome, but overcoming hostilities"; and, in this Agni cycle, VI.16.27 *táranto aryó árátiḥ*

“overcoming the hostilities of the stranger.” Similar to this last passage is VIII.60.12 *tāranto aryā ādīśaḥ* “overcoming the aims of the stranger.” These parallels suggest that the frame of the passage is *ārātīḥ* √ *tī*. The superimposability of the last two passages further suggests that *ārātīḥ* and *ādīśām* in our passage should be equated, since acc. plurals of both serve as obj. of *tārantaḥ* in the same formula, and that *ādīś-* here has negative connotations, unlike some other occurrences of this stem. Of course, the difference in case between them here (acc. pl. *ārātīḥ* versus gen. pl. *ādīśām*) makes the equation tricky, but I think that, in juxtaposing these two negatively viewed objects, the poet has demoted one (*ādīś-*) to a dependent genitive. (That is, rather than having “may we outstrip hostilities (and) (ill-)intentions,” we have “may we outstrip the hostilities *of* (ill-)intentions.”)

The remaining problem in pāda c — and it is a major one — is what to do with the truncated relative clause introduced by *yās te*. Old (ZDMG 55.292, reprised in Noten) considers numerous possibilities, none of which he seems particularly enamoured of, and Ge, Re, Gonda (VedLit. 236), Hoffmann (Fs. Thieme [1980] = Aufs. III.753–54), Scar (708), etc., add more. A number of interpr. take the rel. construction as embedded between the verb *tūryāma* and its object *ārātīḥ*, sometimes by introducing an otherwise unidentified new actor, sometimes by emending *yās* to **yās* to allow it to refer to one of the fem. pl. *ādīśām* or *ārātīḥ*. I would of course prefer to avoid such embedding on principle, and in fact each attempt to produce such an interpr. runs into further difficulties, which require emendation (of the rel. pronoun or of gen. *ādīśām*), highly unusual case usage, or supplying significant amounts of material — or a combination of the three. So embedding does not produce an otherwise clean syntactic or semantic result. I will not rehearse the details of all these ultimately unsatisfactory proposals, but simply present my own (also ultimately unsatisfactory, I’m afraid). I take *tūryāma yāḥ* to be an improper relative construction “... we who ...”, with disharmony in number between the 1st pl. verb and the sg. rel. prn.; the sg. *yāḥ* would have been imported from/enforced by the numerous rel. cl. in this Agni cycle beginning *yās te* and referring to the pious mortal and his ritual service to Agni. Similar 2nd position rel. are VI.2.4 *ṛdhād yās te* ..., 2.5 *samīdhā yās te* ..., and there are also a number of pāda-initial exx. of *yās te*: VI.1.9, 5.5, 13.4, 15.11. Thus, although the overall structure of the sentence in cd is couched as (1st) plural, the template of the “pious mortal” defining relative clause would impose a singular in that construction. (Note that the *person* is unspecified, since the rel. cl. lacks a verb.) In the publ. tr. I supply a verb “serve,” but I would now omit the verb, with the rel. cl. only nominal *yās te* “who is/are yours” or “who is/are for you.” The main-clause verb *tūryāma* would have been fronted around this minimal clause.

We come finally to the simile of pāda d, which again has inspired numerous interpr., which again I will leave undiscussed. The particular issues are 1) the precise sense and reference of (*pari*)*hrút-*, 2) the grammatical identity of *hrútaḥ* and *pátataḥ*, which could both be either gen.-abl. sg. or acc. pl., 3) whether those last two should be construed separately or together, 4) whether √ *pat* can mean ‘fall’ at this period. I answer 4) with a negative, though Ge’s and Scar’s interpr. depend on that sense. I also follow Hoffmann in seeing the simile as depicting a race and racecourse, though

I think *-hrút-* refers to the curves of the racetrack and the curving course of the racehorse. I take both *hrútaḥ* and *pátataḥ* as acc. pl., but in separate syntagms: *pátataḥ* is the obj. of *tūryāma* in the simile and refers to the competing horses “flying” around the course -- thus corresponding to *ārātīḥ* in the frame -- while *hrútaḥ* is construed with *parihrút* as an etymological figure and has no direct correspondent in the frame.

VI.4.6: *ā ... bhānumádbhir arkaīḥ ... tatántha* is an elaboration of VI.6.6 (next hymn) *ā bhānúnā ... tatantha*. In our passage *tatántha* is accented because it follows pāda-initial, extra-sentential voc. *ágne*.

In c *nayat* ‘leads’ would seem to need an obj.; with Re I supply “us.” Ge leaves it object-less.

There is no agreement about where to construe the instr. *śocíṣā*. Re takes it with *aktāḥ* (“oint de flamme(s)”), while Ge’s interpr. isn’t clear (at least to me). I assume it goes with the VP: Agni’s bright flame illuminates the passage around the darkness(es).

I am rather baffled by the simile in d. The vṛddhi form *auśijá-* is usually used as the patronymic of Kakṣivānt, one of the great poets of maṇḍala I (e.g., I.119.9, 122.4, 5), but morphologically it could also simply be a derivative of *uśij-* ‘(type of) priest’. It also occurs once (I.112.11) with the rare word *vañij-* ‘merchant’; that passage also contains Kakṣivānt (though not in the same syntagm). Ge claims that our passage is part of “die Sage vom fliegenden Kaufmann,” but the two other passages he cites (one of them I.112.11) certainly do not add up to a saga, and *dīyan* ‘flying, soaring’ does not have to belong to the simile as he (and Re) take it. I am inclined to think that the referent of *auśijāḥ* is, as usual, Kakṣivānt. His (other) patronymic, according to the Anukramaṇī, is *dairghatamasa* ‘descendent of Dīrghatamas’, another celebrated poet of Maṇḍala I, whose name means ‘having long darkness’ (=blindness, quite possibly). I suggest that we have here a reference to Kakṣivānt via the vṛddhi deriv. *auśija-*, and this reference to Kakṣivānt then obliquely evokes his relationship to Dīrghatamas. So, somewhat ironically, a poet connected to “long darkness” leads us around (/helps us avoid) darkness. I would further suggest that *pátman ... dīyan* “soaring in flight” might refer to soma exhilaration (as in X.119 the Labasūkta). Cf. I.119.9 *māde sómasyauśijó huvanyati* “in the exhilaration of soma, (Kakṣivānt), the son of Uśij, cries out (to you),” where Kakṣivānt, identified as *auśijāḥ*, cries out “in the exhilaration of soma.”

If this nomenclatural intertextuality seems too far-fetched, we can take *auśija-* simply as descended from / connected to (fire-)priests and assume that Agni is being compared to his priest (for, to me, unspecified reasons).

VI.4.7: This vs. has a number of metrical problems or peculiarities. In pāda a the caesura unusually splits the splv. suffix from its base: *mandrá-tamam*; pāda b has an unusual opening (on which see below). Pāda c is, at least by the Pp. analysis, not only a syllable short (hence HvN’s rest at 5), but has a bad cadence for a Triṣṭubh; for

possible solutions, see disc. below. Pāda d also has a bad cadence, but a different one and not easy to fix.

Instr. *arkaśokaiḥ* unites the instrumentals *arkaḥ* of 6a and the *śocīśā* of 6d. I take it as a pun, with *arka-* representing both ‘ray’ and ‘chant’, both of which meanings are found for this stem in nearby passages: in the immediately preceding vs. 6a it means ‘ray’ and refers to the similarity of Agni’s rays to those of the sun; in the next hymn VI.5.5 it appears in a sequence of ritual items, adjacent to *uktaḥ*, and must refer to priestly chants. In our passage “ray-flames” are attributed to Agni, “chant-flames” to “us.”

In b, as noted above, the first word *vavṛmāhe* is metrically bad: a heavy 2nd syllable would be preferable, as it would in the other 4 occurrences of this 1st pl. pf., as well as in 2nd sg. *vavṛṣé*. Kü (459) plausibly suggests that the original reading of this form was **vuvūrmāhe*, as we would expect for this *seṭ* root, which was redactionally changed, as *aniṭ* forms crept into this root. Note the echo *-māhe māhi*.

The accent on *śróṣi* is somewhat troubling, as it is very unlikely to begin a clause. One could construct such a meaning: “Since we have chosen you ... as a great thing for us, listen, o Agni!” But the most natural way to construe the sequence is ... *naḥ śróṣi* “listen to us” (cf., e.g., I.133.6, VI.26.1 (...) *śrudhī naḥ*, etc.), as Old (ZDMG 55.292) also points out, which in turn requires that immediately preceding *māhi* be part of that clause to host the enclitic *naḥ*. Old (ZDMG 55.292–93 and Noten) suggests rather that *śróṣi* is still under the domain of *hí*, but this seems unlikely, since it would involve an asyndetic conjoining of a preterital perfect and a *si*-impv. (/subjunctive). I suggest that the accent was supplied redactionally on the basis of *párṣi* in the next vs. (8b) and, especially, *ghóṣi* in the next hymn (VI.5.6d), both in the same metrical position and receiving their accents honestly. *śróṣi* is also the only attestation of this *si*-imperative, an isolated formation beside the very well-attested root aorist. In particular, there are no *s*-aor. subjunctive forms of the type that regularly support the *si*-impv. I do not entirely understand how or why it was formed, but, given the tight formulaic relationships between the hymns in this Agni cycle, I suggest it may have been based on semantically identical and rhyming *ghóṣi* in VI.5.6; as was discussed above, it is possible that the accent of *śróṣi* is owing to the same source.

As already noted, pāda c is both metrically deficient and afflicted with a bad cadence. Old (both ZDMG 55.293 and Noten) suggests restoring *devātātā*, as in 1a, also pāda final. Though this would fix both metrical problems and would also make contextual sense, I do not understand how such a corruption could have arisen. I prefer, and have adopted, Ge’s suggestion (n. 7cd) to read *vāyúm* beginning pāda d as *vā āyúm*, with *vā* going with the previous pāda. *devātā* appears several times in a Triṣṭubh cadence followed by a monosyllable (IV.44.2, 58.10, VII.85.3) -- so ... *devātā vā#* would be a fine pāda-end -- and the *vā* can easily conjoin the two instr. *śávasā devātā*. The reanalysis of *vā āyúm* to *vāyúm* can have been based on pāda-initial *vāyúr* in 5b. Agni is called *Āyu* on a number of occasions (see, e.g., I.31.11, X.20.7, and Gr s.v. *āyú-* def. 2). Although Ge’s idea seems eminently sensible to me,

it is passed over in silence by Re. An asterisk should be inserted before “Āyu” in the publ. tr.

I do not see any way to improve the cadence in d. The splv. *nṛtama-* is not suitable for the cadence of any Rigvedic meter, though it also appears there in VI.33.3.

VI.5 Agni

VI.5.1: I supply ‘our’ with ‘thoughts’ (*matībhiḥ*) in pāda b, though the subject of the overt verb *huvé* is only 1st singular. I assume that the *vaḥ* ‘for you’ is addressed to the poet’s fellow celebrants and therefore there is an implicit 1st pl. It would, however, also be possible to tr. “with my thoughts.”

invati is obviously a thematized Vth Class pres. (see Gotō, 1st class, p. 76). What is rather surprising is that the athematic stem is found two vss. later, as *inoṣi* in 3c, as well as in the previous hymn (*inóti* VI.4.3; cf. also the impv. *inuhí* in nearby VI.10.7). It is true that *invati* provides a more favorable heavy syllable in 2nd position, but I do not otherwise see the motive for using both stems in this hymn.

Note the etymological connections *yúvānam* ... *yáviṣṭham*, *ádrogha(-vācam)* ... *adhrúk*, and (*viśvá-*)*vārāṇi* (*puru*)*vārah*.

VI.5.2: In almost all occurrences in which it is possible to determine, animate forms of *yajñīya-* refer to gods. They may be the referents here as well: the gods may send goods to Agni to be redistributed to his mortal worshipers.

The syntax of cd is somewhat problematic, since there is incongruity between the simile and the frame. Ge evades this by taking the simile that begins c (*kṣāmeva víśvā bhúvanāni*) with ab: “In dir ... bringen die opferwürdigen (Götter) ... Schätze zum Vorschein wie die Erde alle Geschöpfe,” and beginning a new clause with *yásmín*. This is not impossible, but it is unnecessary and, given the hemistich break, undesirable if another interpr. can work. Various ones have been tried (see Old, ZDMG 455.293 and Noten), but, flg. Old, I think it is yet another example of case disharmony in similes, utilizing two possible alternative interpr. of the verb (*sám* ...) *dadhiré*. In the frame this medial verb has a passive sense ‘be held, encompassed’, with *saúbhagāni* as subj. For this construction cf. VI.38.3 *bráhmā ca gíro dadhiré sám asmín* “the sacred formulations and the songs together have been placed (/are encompassed) in him.” But the same verb form can also be transitive, with the object expressing what is encompassed or placed. This is the construction of the simile, with nom. *kṣāma* (or *kṣāmā*? see Old) and acc. *víśvā bhúvanāni*. For such a transitive construction, cf. III.19.4 *bhūrṇi hí tvé dadhiré ánikā* ... *yájyavo jánāsaḥ* “the peoples eager to sacrifice have established in you [=the fire] your many faces.” In our passage the *object* of the simile thus corresponds to the *subject* of the frame; that both are neut. pl. makes their correspondence easier to process, despite their different grammatical functions.

VI.5.3: As noted above ad vs. 1, we have both thematized *ínva-* and athem. *inó-* in this hymn, with very similar objects: *drávināni* ‘movable goods’ (1c), *vásūni* ‘goods’ (3d). As was also noted above, ad VI.4.3, Ge (and others: cf. Gr and Re) construes the *ví* opening pāda d with *inoṣi* in c and uses this supposed lexeme to argue that *ví ... inóti* in VI.4.3 has positive value. As I argued there, *ví ... inóti* is more likely to mean ‘dispel’ and to take a negatively viewed object. In our passage here I do not think that *ví* belongs with *inoṣi*. Instead I think *ví* forms a phrase with immediately following *ānuṣák*; cf. the same pāda-initial expression I.58.3, 72.7, IV.12.3, as well as #*ví ... ānuṣák*# V.16.2. I assume that the expression arose from passages like I.72.7 *vy ānuṣak ... dhāḥ* “distribute in due order” with *ví √dhā* (reinforced here by *vidhaté*), and then *ví* and *ānuṣák* became phrasally fused.

VI.5.4–5: These two vss. are contrastively paired: each has a generalizing rel. clause describing the activities of a mortal -- harmful in 4ab, beneficial in 5ab -- while the 2nd hemistichs of each set out the results of such actions. The pairing is further emphasized by the phonological similarities of the oppositional verbs *abhidāsat* ‘will assail’ (4a) and *dādāsat* (5b) ‘will ritually serve’.

VI.5.4: Note the extreme etymological figure that occupies the whole of pāda d: *tápā tapiṣṭha tāpasā tāpasvān*. For the last two words, see the parallel structure in 6b.

VI.5.5: I now would be inclined to take *samídhā* as an abstract “with kindling,” rather than as the concrete material “with kindling wood” as in the publ. tr. See disc. ad VI.1.9, 2.5.

VI.5.6: The pāda-final *sáhasā sáhasvān* is morphologically entirely parallel to 4d *tápasā tāpasvān*.

In d *tád* may not be a temporal adverb as in the publ. tr., but a neut. acc. obj. of *juṣasva*, with which ‘speech’ vel sim. should be supplied. So Ge and Re -- e.g., Ge “so freue dich an diesem (Gedicht) des Sängers.” However, since *√jus* can take a gen. complement (though more rarely than the acc.), *jaritúḥ* may be construed directly with the verb, as in the publ. tr.

On *ghóṣi*, which I take as an anomalous *-si* imperative, see comm. ad IV.4.8, which contains the other occurrence of this form. On the possible relationship between *ghóṣi* and *śróṣi* in VI.4.7, see comm. ad loc.

VI.5.7: This vs. is characterized by etymological figures: b *rayīm rayivaḥ*, c *vājam ... vājāyantah*, d *ajarājáram* -- a stylistic tick found also in vss. 1, 4, and 6 -- see comm. ad locc.

VI.6 Agni

VI.6.1: The subject of this vs. is not overtly expressed, but it cannot be Agni, who is the acc. goal. Re cleverly suggests that the subject is indicated by the participle

gr̥ṇánt- ‘singing, singer’ in the last pāda of this hymn. If so, this is an oblique form of ring composition.

Contrary to my usual principles, rather than construing *návyasā* with *yajñéna* in the next pāda (so Ge, Re), I supply a form of ‘speech’. I do so on the grounds that *návyas-*, particularly in the instr., is specialized to the realm of speech. Cf. *návyasā vácasā* (VI.62.5) as well as the famous pāda-final disharmonious formula *návyasā vácaḥ* (II.31.5, VI.48.11, VIII.39.2), along with fem. forms of the comparative with different ‘speech, thought’ words (e.g., nearby VI.8.1 *matír návyasī*).

The hapax *vṛścád-vana-* ‘hewing wood’ shows the poet’s penchant for the type of cmpd. that provides his name, *Bharád-vāja*. Cf. also *rdhád-vāra-* in VI.3.2.

VI.6.2: The first hemistich mixes the visual and the audible in a species of synaesthesia, esp. clear in the description of Agni as “brightening thunder,” but note also his “ever-roaring” flames.

The standard tr. construe *purūṇi pr̥thūni* with *bhárvan*; e.g., Ge “die vielen, breiten (Flächen) fressend.” But nearby VI.12.5 *anuyāti pr̥thvīm* favors taking the acc. as an acc. of extent with the verb *anuyāti*, as in the publ. tr.

Note the phonetic figure in *pāvakāḥ purutámaḥ purūṇi, pr̥thūni*, esp. the last three words, of which the first two also etymologically related.

VI.6.3: Alliteration continues, with *ví ... víṣvak* (a), *śuce śúcayaḥ* (b), *návagvā vānā vananti* (cd). The first two are etymological figures; in the third, intricately structured one, *vānā vananti* is not, but mimics one.

Flg. Ge (fld. by Re), I assume that the Navagvas are in an unmarked simile: the flames break and overcome the woods as the Navagvas broke Vala. The gapping of the simile marker *ná* would not be surprising in the *-na*-rich environment of the figure noted above: *návagvā vānā vananti*: we might have expected *divyā *ná návagvā*, and haplology would not be surprising.

The identity of the root found in *tuvi-mrakṣá-* is disputed; see EWA s.v. *MARC*, with $\sqrt{mr̥c}$ ‘harm’, $\sqrt{mr̥j}$ ‘wipe’, and $\sqrt{mr̥ś}$ ‘touch’ all possibly in play. $\sqrt{mr̥c}$ ‘harm’ seems the most likely to me. The Schwebeablaut outcome *-mrakṣ-* is standard with the heavy cluster *-kṣ-* ending the root syllable, like *drakṣyati* to $\sqrt{dr̥ś}$ (see AiG I.212–13), and would necessarily be invoked for any of the roots just listed.

VI.6.4: In my view (flg. Re), the rel. cl. of the first hemistich hangs off the previous vs. 3 and supplies the subject (*śúcayaḥ* ‘flames’) of *vananti* in 3d. However, Ge takes the rel. prn. *yé* as a stand-in for ‘wenn’, providing a subordinate clause to cd, with its resumptive *ádha*. The conspicuous alliteration of vs. 3, continued here (4a) — *śukrāsaḥ śúcayaḥ śuciṣmah*, also a triple etymological figure — might be a weak arg. in favor of a connection with vs. 3, esp. 3b *śuce śúcayaḥ*.

In b *kṣām* must be read disyllabically.

In the publ. tr. “like” should be enclosed in parens, as there is no overt simile marker in b. The question is why the flames are likened to “unharnessed horses” (*vīṣitāso áśvāḥ*). Ge and Re think they are grazing, and this interpr. might fit well

with *vápanti* ‘shear, shave’ -- a slightly different image of what happens to vegetation when fire moves across the earth: grazing “shears” the grasses like shaving does. However, I tend to think that *vísita-* adds a different semantic dimension: horses out of harness racing about wildly without control.

In d the standard view (e.g., Ge, Re, Macd [*Hymns*, p. 74], Klein [DGRV II.106], Mau [p. 24]), fld. also in the publ. tr., is that the gen. *pṛśneḥ*, lit. ‘speckled, dappled’, refers to the earth. And this seems perfectly reasonable. However, it should be noted that *pṛśni-* is nowhere else unambiguously used of the earth in the RV. Though Re (comm. ad loc.) suggests that there is such a ref. in IV.5.7, 10, those are desperately obscure passages and nothing can be built upon them. Generally *pṛśni-* names the mother of the Maruts, who seems to have been a dappled cow, and “dappled (cow)” → “earth” is not a difficult step in RVic discourse. Still it should be kept in mind that it’s a step that hasn’t otherwise been taken.

VI.6.5: The rendering of *goṣu-yúdh-* as ‘cattle-raider’ loses the specificity of the loc. pl. 1st member, but ‘of the one battling for cattle’ seemed excessively heavy.

The hapax *kṣāti-* is built to $\sqrt{kṣā}$ ‘burn’. I have borrowed the felicitous bilingual pun ‘ardor’ from Maurer.

On Gotō’s posited \sqrt{di} ‘destroy’ supposedly found in *dayate* here, see comm. ad III.34.1. There is no need for a separate root, as ‘divides’ → ‘fragments’ is a plausible semantic pathway.

VI.6.6: This vs. has a number of connections with phraseology elsewhere in this Agni cycle: *ā ... bhānumádbhiḥ ... tatántha* (VI.4.6): *ā bhānúnā ... tatantha* (6a); *dhr̥ṣatā* (3d, 6b); *spṛdho bādhasva* (VI.5.6): *bādhasva ... spṛdhaḥ* (6cd, though with the two forms belonging to separate clauses, not a VP as in 5.6); *vanuṣyāt* (VI.5.4): *vanuṣyān vanúṣaḥ* (6d).

The referent of the gen. phrase *mahás todásya* ‘great goad’ is not entirely clear -- some take it as some feature of Agni (e.g., Ge), others as the sun (e.g., Mau). Most construe it with *bhānúnā* (as I do), though Re takes it with *pārthivāni jráyāṃsi*. If, as is likely, it goes with *bhānúnā*, this provides a good clue to its identity. The *bahuvrīhi svār-bhānu-* ‘having the radiance of the sun’ is obviously based on a genitival tatpuruṣa **svar-bhānú-* ‘radiance of the sun’, and GEN. *bhānú-* would simply be the analytic version of this cmpd., with the phrase *mahás todásya* substituted for putative gen. **sūraḥ* or **sūryasya*. VI.4.6 *ā sūryo ná bhānumádbhir arkaíḥ* “like the sun with its radiant rays” provides further support for this interpr. Although it is true that in nearby VI.12.1, 3 the ‘goad’ (*todá-*) appears to be Agni, the qualifier ‘great’ in “great goad” here might point to the cosmic body, the sun, of which the earthly fire is a less powerful earthly counterpart.

VI.6.7: The insistent etymological alliteration in this vs. seems to me inartful overkill, though it certainly provides an explosive climax. The forms of \sqrt{cit} in the first hemistich — *citra citráṃ citáyantam ... citrakṣatra citrátamam* — give way to \sqrt{cand} in a slightly more restrained array, *candrám ... cándra candrābhiḥ*. Since

both roots belong to the same semantic sphere and begin with *c*, the difference in effect between the hemistichs is minimal.

It is not clear what should be supplied with the fem. instr. pl. *candrābhiḥ*. The standard tr. use ‘flames’, and I’ve followed suit, but *śúci-*, which figured in vss. 3-4, is unfortunately masc. when used as a noun. Re suggests alternatively *stutíbhiḥ* ‘praises’ (fld. by Mau), pointing to the adjacent *gṛnaté* ‘singer’, but it is more natural to take the instr. *candrābhiḥ* with Agni syntactically, rather than construing it with the dat. participle, and further, *candrā-* seems never to be used with verbal products.

VI.7 Agni Vaiśvānara

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is heavily seeded with forms of $\sqrt{\text{jan}}$ ‘beget, be born’. The epithet *vaiśvānarā-* is also found in every vs. (1b, 2c, 3c, 4d, 5a, 6a, 7a), in all cases initial in its pāda.

VI.7.1–2: These two vss. are paired, both ending with *janayanta devāḥ* and sharing an opening pāda with the structure ACC SG + GEN ACC SG + GEN; this NP structure is also found at the end of 1c and 2c (one iteration each), but is upended by GEN + ACC SG *yajñāsya ketúm* in 2d. It is perhaps a measure of the sensitivity of the RV to subtle patterns that this syntactic metathesis feels strikingly disruptive. It may well be that the poet generated this disruptive order in order to call attention to this very phrase; see the importance of the word *ketú-* in vss. 5 and 6, with the comm. there. There is an important difference, however: here the “beacon of the sacrifice” must be Agni, whereas in vss. 5–6 it is the sun.

There are only three finite verbs in this two-vs. sequence, all injunctives: 1d *janayanta*, 2b *abhí sám navanta*, 2d *janayanta*. The temporal reference is therefore unspecified. I tr. them as preterites (as do Ge and Re) on the assumption that Agni’s begetting by the gods happened only once in the mythological past. It would be different if priests were the subject.

VI.7.1: Since Agni is often called the mouth of the gods, Ge (and others) assume that the loc. *āsán* in d refers to Agni, and the gods have produced a drinking cup (*pātram*) to put in his mouth. But this requires Ge to treat the three-pāda accusative phrase that opens the hymn and refers to Agni as grammatically untethered, as an anacoluthon with the referent picked up in the loc. in pāda d (see his n. 1d). But, with Re, I see no reason why Agni cannot be conceptualized here as the cup that the gods drink from. Re considers *āsán* simply an attribute limiting the *pātra-*, a “réipient pour la bouche, réipient à boire,” while I take it as referring to the gods’ (collective) mouth.

Note the phonologically matching words *aratím* and *átithim* stationed in the same metrical position in pādas a and c.

VI.7.2: On *mahām* as acc. sg. masc. see AiG III.251, EWA s.v. *mahānt*, p. 338.

The paradox of calling fire “a great watering trough” (*āhāvā-*) simply sharpens the slightly discordant image in 1c of Agni as ‘cup’. Although *āhāvā-* is clearly derived from $\sqrt{\text{hu}}$, a standard lexeme for the oblations that Agni would be

receiving, this particular noun is associated with a well in X.101.5 and is therefore associated with more mundane acts of pouring water (which of course should extinguish fire). Agni is a trough because the gods get their “water” there.

VI.7.3–5: The middle of the hymn is characterized by initial (or modified initial) forms of the 2nd sg. prn.: 3a *tvát*, 3b *tvát*, 3c VOC *tvám*, 4a *tvām*, 4c *táva*, 5a VOC *táva*.

VI.7.4: *abhí sám navante* reprises *abhí sám navanta* of 2b and perhaps confirms the preterital interpr. of that injunctive, since the verb in this vs. is marked as pres., though the gods are also subject here. However, how to interpret the tense values in the 2nd hemistich is unclear. Pāda c has an unambiguous impf. *āyan*, which, with its goal of immortality (*amṛtatvám*), would seem to refer to the remote mythological past (though see below). The verb is the last pāda, *ádīdeḥ*, can be either a plupf. (to the older stative pf. *dīdāya*) or an impf. to the new redupl. pres. remodeled from the pf. stem (Kū opts for the impf.; see 228). But whatever its morphological identity, it seems to refer to an event in the immediate past or the immediate neighborhood -- assuming that *pitróḥ* refers to the two kindling sticks -- namely, the regularly repeated kindling of the fire. This interpr. would be supported by 5c with pres. part.: *jāyamānaḥ pitrór upásthe* “being born in the lap of your two parents.” In the publ. tr. I assumed that the first hemistich refers to the regular kindling of the fire and the gods’ response, while the 2nd one refers to the Ur-kindling in mythological time. However, I now wonder if we should interpret the abstract *amṛtatvám* in c in light of the voc. *amṛta* in pāda a. In the first hemistich Agni is addressed as “immortal one” when he is being born and the gods cry out to him; indeed the voc. “o immortal one” might be the content of their cry, expressed in the verb *abhí sám navante*. In the second hemistich the gods went to immortality (*amṛtatvám*), that is, to the abstract quality possessed by the one addressed as *amṛta*, and they did so “according to your [=Agni’s] intentions” (*táva krátubhiḥ*), again when he was born. The gods’ journey to *amṛtatvám* may therefore not be one of the distant mythic past (or not only of the distant past), but one they undertake whenever he is kindled. The abstract principle of immortality may also be found in the gen. *amṛtasya* in the last pāda of the hymn (7d), where Agni is identified as its protector.

Note that the phrase *vísve ... devāḥ*, parcelled out over two pādas, may teasingly invite us to connect the first term, *vísve*, with the dominant epithet in this hymn, *vaiśvānará-*.

VI.7.5: The disjunction between pf. *dadharṣa* in the main clause of b and impf. *āvindaḥ* in the subord. cl. of d is likewise a bit disturbing. Flg. Kū (266), the publ. tr. renders the perfect presentially as “ventures against,” but I might be tempted to change that now to “has ventured against” (cf. Ge’s “... hat noch keiner angetastet”). The question is what is the relationship between the two clauses. I think that Agni’s *vratás* are those that he established after he discovered (*āvindaḥ*) the phenomenon in d.

This in turn raises the question of what that phenomenon is and, more precisely, to which noun (*ketúm* or *vayúneṣu*) the gen. *áhnām* belongs. Most (Ge, Re, Old) take it with *vayúneṣu*; cf., e.g., Re “quand ... tu eus découvert le signal-lumineux pour les jalonnements des jours.” Old, who should know better, even cites word order as support of this interpr. And certainly *áhnām* does (once) occur with *vayúna-*: II.19.3 *aktúnāhnāṇ vayúnāni sādhat* “He perfected the patterns of the days through the night.” But far more often *áhnām* limits *ketú-*, several times in a Vaiśvānara context: VII.5.5 *vaiśvānarām uṣásam ketúm áhnām* “V., the beacon of the dawns and of the days”; X.88.12 *vaiśvānarām ketúm áhnām akṛnvan* “they made V. the beacon of the days.” Cf. also III.34.4 *ketúm áhnām*, X.85.19 *áhnām ketúr uṣásam*, and VI.39.3 *imām ketúm adadhur nū cid áhnām*, this last with separation between the noun and its gen. as in our passage. In my interpr. of this pāda the *vayúna-* are the ritual patterns, the regularly repeated sequence of events in the ritual, including the kindling of the fire. The “beacon of the days” is the sun, which rises at that kindling. (clarified in the next vs.), in contrast to the “beacon of the sacrifice” in 2d, which is Agni. Note that Agni, addressed as Vaiśvānara, is here distinct from the sun, which he finds. (See further ad vs. 6.). Finding the beacon of the days in the (ritual) patterns means recognizing and replicating the regular rising of the sun that coincides with the kindling of the ritual fire. As usual in Rigvedic discourse the correct performance of ritual governs the rhythms of the natural world.

To return to the question of the relationship between the two hemistichs, I suggest that the “great *vratás*” of Agni that no one has/does venture against are the ritual patterns, esp. the dawn kindling, which in turn control the repeated return of the “beacon of the days.”

VI.7.6: This vs. continues, and clarifies, the theme of the 2nd hemistich of vs. 5. Although Agni as Vaiśvānara is often identified with the sun and although several of the passages cited immediately above, ad 5d, identify Vaiśvānara with the “beacon of the days,” here Agni Vaiśvānara is separate from the sun (as indeed he was in 5cd), which is his eye (*vaiśvānarasya ... cákṣasā*) and which is further characterized as “the beacon of the immortal one” (*amṛtasya ketúnā*), taking up the *ketú-* of 5d, which Agni found. The sun “measures out the backs of heaven” by crossing the sky on his daily passage.

In c the referent of *tasya* in the phrase *tasya ... mūrdhāni* “on his head / on the head of this one” is not specified and could either be the sun, as expressed by the instr. of ab, or Agni Vaiśvānara. It is surely the latter, however: *mūrdhāni* echoes the first word of the hymn, *mūrdhānam*, which refers to Agni himself as the “head of heaven.” And the *vīśvā bhūvanāni* “all creatures” who take their place on this head are a twist on Agni’s epithet *vaiśvānarā-* ‘belonging to all men’, which dominates this hymn.

On the formation of *visrúh-*, which occurs only here and in V.44.3, see comm. ad V.44.3, where I connect it (as a number of others do) to $\sqrt{ru(d)h}$ ‘grow’. In our passage this etymological connection is actualized in the figure *ruruhuḥ ... visrúhaḥ*, and the vegetative image is further anchored by the simile *vayā iva* “like twigs.”

With Re (and Kellens, *Noms. rac.*, 82–83), I think the ‘outgrowths’ are Agni’s flames, but unlike those two I would not *translate* *visrúhaḥ* as ‘flames’: it’s a metaphor.

VI.7.7: In this vs. the subject of the cosmogonic *ví√mā* ‘measure out’ is Agni Vaiśvānara, not the sun, as in the immediately preceding vs., and the more usual identification of Agni Vaiśvānara with the sun seems to have reasserted itself. See VI.8.2.

In a *sukrátuḥ* reprises *krátubhiḥ* in 4c, and it might have been better to render the *krātu-* in the same way -- either as “by your resolutions” ... “the very resolute one” or “by your intentions” ... “he of good intention.”

VI.8 Agni Vaiśvānara

This hymn, like the last, is dedicated to Agni Vaiśvānara and has a form of this epithet in every vs. but 5, always pāda-initial as in VI.7. However, the hymn is somewhat different from VI.7. In that hymn Agni Vaiśvānara was distinct from and dominated the sun (see esp. VI.7.5–6) until the last vs., while in this hymn the usual identification of Agni Vaiśvānara and the sun is in evidence. See esp. vs. 2.

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is also heavy with initial *v*’s, esp. in the earlier parts of the hymn, which index the epithet. Note esp. the three hemistichs that begin with the preverb *ví* (2c, 3a, 3c), as well as 1ab ... *vṛṣnaḥ* ... *vocaṃ vidáthā* ..., 2ab ... *vyòmani*, *vratāni* ... *vratapā* ..., 3cd ... *avartayad*, *vaiśvānaró víśvam* ... *vṛṣṇyam*.

VI.8.1: On *prkṣá-* see comm. ad II.34.3.

VI.8.2: Here Agni Vaiśvānara is “being born in highest distant heaven” (*jāyamaṇaḥ paramé vyòmani*), presumably in the form of the sun, in contrast to VI.7.5 with the same participle but a different location: *jāyamānaḥ pitrór upásthe* “being born in the lap of your parents,” usually a kenning for the ritual kindling sticks, so that VI.7.5 refers to the kindling of the ritual fire. In that vs. Agni found the sun (“beacon of the days”), which was therefore distinct from him, and in the next vs. (VI.7.6) the backs of heaven were measured out by the sun as an organ -- the eye -- of Agni Vaiśvānara (*vaiśvānarasya vímitāni cákṣasā, sñnūni diváḥ*). Only in the last vs. of that hymn, VI.7.7, did Agni Vaiśvānara himself measure out the cosmos and take on his usual solar aspect. The two pādas VI.7.7a (*ví yó rájāṃsy ámimīta sukrātuḥ*) and our VI.8.2c (*vy àntarikṣam amimīta sukrātuḥ*) are almost identical, but the former represents the resolution of the disjunction between Agni Vaiśvānara and the sun, while no such disjunction is found in our hymn.

VI.8.3: The cosmogonic activities of Agni Vaiśvānara continue here, but I would argue that they are instances of the *daily* creation of the cosmos by the light of the sun. The propping apart of the two world halves refers to the visual separation of earth and sky at the horizon at first light, and the rolling out of the two skins is a similar image, of the full extent of earth and sky revealed to sight at that time.

It is not entirely clear why Agni Vaiśvānara is called an “unerring ally” (*mitró ābhutaḥ*; see the identical phrase in I.94.13 and similar I.77.3 *mitró ná bhūd ādbhutasya rathīḥ*). Agni is of course regularly identified as an ally (*mitrá-*) and is compared to Mitra because of his role as go-between between gods and men; in this particular case the sun’s role as the most visible of the gods and the heavenly being most clearly engaged with human life may have elicited this description. The covert presence of Mitra here may also play off the covert presence of Varuṇa in 2b, in the phrase *vratāni ... vratapā arakṣata* “as protector of *vratas*, he guarded the *vratas*: *vratás* are Varuṇa’s special province, although curiously Varuṇa is never called *vratapā-* in the RV.

The interpr. of pāda b is disputed because of disagreement about the sense and formation of *antarvāvat* (also found in I.40.7). Ge tr. the pāda as “er zerteilte die dazwischenliegende Finsternis durch das Licht” (almost identically also Oberlies Relig. I.191), presumably with the ‘between’ sense of *antár* nominalized with the complex suffix *-vā-vant-*. Re denies that the formation has a complex (or duplicate) suffix but rather considers it an imitation of *arvāvāt* ‘nearby’, despite the difference in accent, and renders the word (in his note) as “un domaine intérieur (= invisible).” His tr. of the pāda is “il a fait que les ténèbres (devinssent) par la lumière un domaine-cachée.” So, he takes *antár* in the meaning ‘within’, but the further morphological analysis is unclear. Old (ad I.40.7) also sees the ‘within’ sense of *antár* here, but with a more plausible interpr. of the suffixal material — with the whole meaning ‘inhaltsvoll’ (that is, ‘having [something] within’). He also considers it is entirely or roughly synonymous with *antárvant-*. (Both of these views are also found in AiG II.2.893, and the whole is laid out with admirable clarity by Schmidt [B+I 102]. Both AiG and Schmidt explain *-vā-vant-* as pleonastic.) The second observation seems to me the most important clue: *antárvant-* is in fact only attested in the fem. *antárvatī-* (III.55.5, X.91.6) in the meaning ‘pregnant’. In both I.40.7 and our passage here the ‘pregnant’ sense is used metaphorically of non-females (*kṣáya-* ‘dwelling place’ in the former, *támas-* ‘darkness’ in the latter). (So also Schmidt; AiG doesn’t go quite this far.) One could speculate that the pleonastic suffix is used because a non-fem. *antárvant-* would seem distinctly odd, and the addition of a second suffix attenuated this oddness. In our case, the *antarvāvat* can directly modify neut. *támaḥ*; in I.40.7, since *kṣáya-* is masc., the connection is less direct. See comm. ad loc. In our passage this interpr. produces a striking image, of the darkness of night swelling with light as day breaks.

VI.8.4: I have no idea what the buffaloes (*mahiṣāḥ*) are doing here or why they do what they do in the lap of the waters. Ge (n. 4a) suggests that the buffaloes are the gods or the old singers, but this does not actually explain anything (including why they would be called buffaloes). Ge notes the very similar passage X.45.3 *trītye tvā rájasi tasthivāṃsam, apām upásthe mahiṣā avaradhan* “The buffalos strengthened you, who were standing in the third realm, in the lap of the waters.” That passage occurs in a hymn concerned with Agni’s triple birth, one of which is in the waters, but the identity of the buffaloes remains unclear. In X.8.1 it is Agni himself who as buffalo

grows strong in the same place: *apām upásthe mahiṣo vavardha* “the buffalo has grown strong in the lap of the waters.”

The second pāda shows the connection between Agni Vaiśvānara and royal power and the second hemistich the connection between that thematic complex and Vivasvant, as Proferes convincingly argues (*Sovereignty*, pp. 28–29 and *passim*).

Note the phonological intertwining of #*vīśo* ... / ... *vivāsvato* # *vaiśvānaró* ...

VI.8.5: In the first hemistich the distribution of the accusatives is at issue: *vidathyām ... rayīm yaśásam ... návyasīm*. The first, *vidathyām*, must be either masc. or neut.; *yaśásam* is ambiguous between masc. and fem. (though far more often masc. than fem.); *návyasīm* is clearly fem. The sole noun, *rayīm*, is generally held to be normally masc., but occasionally fem. Although I think this statement is true, I also think that the number of supposedly fem. occurrences can be considerably reduced, to the point that apparently fem. examples should be viewed as aberrancies, not as normal if rare usages. In this particular case Old (ZDMG 55.296 [=KISch 755], not restated in Noten) and Ge decide that *rayīm* must be fem. here, as evidenced by *návyasīm*, so that another noun must be supplied for *vidathyām* to modify. Old supplies *agnīm* and takes that phrase as an obj. to the part. *grṇádbhyaḥ* (without tr.), while Ge supplies *vīrām* (which does indeed occur with *vidathyām* in I.91.20 and VII.36.8) as an obj. parallel to *rayīm*: “... einen in Weisheit tüchtigen (Mann) ... und Ansehen bringenden neuen Reichtum.” Re allows everything to modify *rayīm*: “une richesse (émanant) des participations-rituelles, (richesse) honorable, plus nouvelle,” with his n. on the gender mixture seemingly meant to cast obscurity rather than illumination. In my opinion, *rayīm* is masc. here, modified by *vidathyām* and *yaśásam* (so also Thieme, Unters. 48, who simply elides *návyasīm*), and *návyasīm* belong to a separate NP, for which I supply *matí-* ‘thought’, which appears in the phrase *matír návyasī* in the first vs. of the hymn, 1c. Note that vs. 1 also contains a form of *vidátha-* ‘ceremony, rite of distribution’, to which our *vidathyā-* must belong (*pace* Ge, who seems to derive it from $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘know’). In vs. 1 the poet proclaims the *vidáthā* of Agni and announces that a “newer thought” is being prepared for him. In this vs. he asks Agni to keep providing both wealth for the *vidátha-* and a “newer (thought).” Although Agni does not himself compose the poem, it is a commonplace of RVic discourse that the gods provide the inspiration for the poets’ compositions.

In the 2nd hemistich Ge and Re take *téjasā* with the simile (“mit dem Schärfe (der Axt)” and “avec l’aigu (de la hache)” respectively), while I attribute the sharpness only to Agni in the frame. Certainly their interpr. fits the word order well (*vanínam ná téjasā*), though it doesn’t necessarily require *téjasā* to be part of the simile. On the other hand, it does require *pavyéva* at the beginning of the hemistich to be dissociated from the later simile or at least considerably sidelined. In the end, I would go for a compromise position, that *téjasā* should be read with both simile and frame: “as if with a metal wheel rim, hew down the curser with your sharpness like a tree with the sharpness (of an axe vel sim.).”

I have not separately rendered *nīcā* in the phrase *nīcā ní vṛśca*, which seems simply to reinforce the *ní*.

VI.8.6: Both Ge and Re take *ajāram* with *suvīryam* (e.g., “die unbeugsame Herrschaft, das nicht verwelkende Heldentum”), while I take it with *kṣātram*. The Ge/Re interpr. is perfectly possible, and there are no grammatical or syntactic features to allow a clear decision. My interpr. is based on the rhetorical arg. that the two privative adjectives (*ánāmi* and *ajāram*) belong together, but I can also see that rhetoric might also favor parallel phrases: PRIV-ADJ. X, PRIV-ADJ. Y. My other, quite faint, consideration was that the adj. *ajāra-* was used of the king (=Agni) in the previous vs. (*rājan ... ajara*) and would transfer easily from the king to his dominion (*kṣatrā-*).

VI.8.7: On Ge’s proposed emendation of *iṣte* to *iṣṭébhiḥ* see comm. ad I.143.7, which has the same form in a lexically and rhetorically similar passage (containing, inter alia, *pāhi* and *ádabdhebhiḥ*). Old (ZDMG 55.296 = KISch. 755) is adamantly opposed to Ge’s suggestion, and there seems no good reason to emend the passage and no obvious trigger for such a corruption.

It is difficult not to interpr. the -iṣ-aor. injunc. *prá ... tāriḥ* as an impv., given its overt coordination with *rákṣā* in pāda c.

VI.9 Agni Vaiśvānara

On the structure of this complex hymn and for a verse-by-verse synopsis, see publ. intro. It has been much translated and discussed -- in addition to the usual treatments, see, e.g., Thieme, *Gedichte*; Renou, *Hymnes spéculatifs*; Wendy Doniger, *Rig Veda*. Oldenberg (ZDMG 55.296–97) gives a detailed (for him) account of the contents and pronounces it an *ākhyāna*, an opinion repeated in the *Noten*, though he doesn’t spell out who the speakers might be verse by verse. Gonda (*Vedic Literature*, 99) calls it “a profound glorification of Agni as the great immortal conceived as the inner light and placed among the mortals to guide them in the mysteries and intricacies of the ritual.” As discussed in the publ. intro., the hymn concerns the development of the poet’s craft and resembles IV.5, in which the poet also receives his poetic inspiration from Agni Vaiśvānara. I do not see the poetic contest (brahmodya) that others (starting with Geldner [*Ved. Stud.* II.181–82], fld by Re, Doniger, George Thompson [“Brahmodya”]) take as the *mise en scène* of the hymn. See Old’s explicit rejection of the brahmodya interpr. (ZDMG 55.297), with which I concur. The brahmodya interpr. primarily rests on a brief phrase in vs. 2, on which see below.

VI.9.1: The first hemistich has two nom./acc. dual expressions (*áhaś ca kṛṣṇám áhar árjunaṃ ca* and *rájasī*) and a dual verb *ví vartete*. The question is which of the two dual expressions is the subject of this verb, or is the subject both or neither? The standard interpr. (Old, Ge, Re, Doniger) is that both expressions serve as subject and that *rájasī*, usually an expression referring to space, here qualifies the two day(-halves), light and dark. However, flg. Thieme, I instead take *rájasī* as an accusative expressing extent of space, preferring to keep the temporal and spatial concepts

separate. I do have to admit that an image of rolling out the dual spaces finds support in the preceding hymn, VI.8.3c *ví cármaṇīva dhiṣāṇe avartayat* “He rolled out the two Holy Places [=world-halves] like skins,” and even more so in VII.80.1 *vivartáyantīm rájasī sámante* “(Dawn,) unrolling the two adjoining realms.” The object of the transitive *ví vartáya-* in those passages should be the subject of the intrans. simplex verb. Nonetheless, see nearby VI.7.7 *ví yó rájāṃsi ánimīta* “who measured out the dusky realms,” with *rájas-* as object, and the frequent use of *ví* to refer to movement through space. As I see it, the image here is of the day and night proceeding through the cosmos, spreading first light and then darkness. Since *ví* can also be used for alternating movement, that notion is also probably present: “The black day and the silvery day roll out *alternately* through the two dusky realms,” referring to the regular alternation of night and day.

Re points out two minor anomalies in word placement: *ca* in pāda a, *ná* in pāda c. The first is not immediately second in its constituent (expect **áhaś cārjunam*, like the first constituent *áhāś ca kṛṣṇám*, not *áhar árjunam ca*). Klein (DGRV I.133) suggests that the construction is a conflation of the expected sequence (given as starred just above) and one with only an adjective in the second constituent (*kṛṣṇám cāhar árjunam ca*, as he constructs it). This is possible but seems somewhat over-complex. It’s worth noting that a properly placed *ca* would be damaging to the meter, whether it was read undistracted (*cārjunam*), the more common option for *ca* + V, or distracted (*ca árjunam*). I had thought that another argument for the unusual placement might be that *ca* + V is generally avoided, but a quick glance at Lubotsky turns up about 70 instances of *ca* + V (out of 1094 total instances of *ca*). I doubt that this represents a statistically significant underrepresentation, although I ran no tests.

As for *ná*, it ordinarily is also positioned after the first element in the simile, but it is highly unlikely (that is, quite impossible) that Agni is being compared to a king *being born*, with the simile comprising *jāyamāno ná rājā*, but rather Agni, even as he is being kindled, is compared to the victorious (adult) king, with the simile just *ná rājā*. Such “wrong” positioning is not unprecedented — other examples have been noted in the comm. — and, as Re points out, it is “masked to the eyes” by *jāyamānaḥ*, which matches *rājā* in number, gender, and case.

VI.9.1–2: Note the echo of the last word of vs. 1, *tāmāṃsi*, in the last word of the 1st hemistich of b, *’tamānāḥ*. The latter form is the pres. part. to the 1st class pres. of *√at* ‘wander’, with aphoresis of the initial vowel after *samaré*. This abhinihita sandhi, relatively rare in the RV, is metrically guaranteed, and it may have been applied in order to bring the participle more into phonological line with *tāmāṃsi*.

VI.9.2: The 1st person speaker, the poet in training, takes over here, with a statement of his ignorance about his own metier. He expresses this ignorance in the metaphor of weaving, a well-known trope for poetic composition that reaches back into Indo-European antiquity.

The main support for the brahmodya interpr. is the loc. *samaré*, which is almost universally construed with (*á*)*tamānāḥ* in the sense “entering the contest” (vel

sim.: Ge: “wenn sie in den Wettstreit eintreten,” Re: “quand ils marchent dans l’arène”). But this bends the sense of both words. The other occurrence of the medial participle *átamāna-* (II.38.3) does not signal the type of purposeful motion implied by those translations; there are no other middle forms in the RV, only a single active (I.30.4), whose goal-oriented motion can be accounted for by both the voice and the presence of a preverb. Assuming that \sqrt{at} is continued by younger \sqrt{at} (see EWA, s.v. *AT*), the usual gloss of the root, ‘wander’, is probably accurate. As for *samará-*, it is obviously formed of the same elements (*sám* \sqrt{r} lit. ‘come/move together’) as *samárana-*, which does usually mean ‘collision, conflict’ (cf. also the hapax denom. *samaryáti*), and it has a derivative *samaryá-* that generally refers to the same. But *samará-* itself is found only twice elsewhere, both times in the meaning ‘gathering, confluence’ with a genitive expressing goods or spoils (VI.47.6 *samaré vásūnām*, X.139.3 *samaré dhānānām*), a benign assemblage rather than a hostile clashing together. Thus, “entering the contest” is at best a weakly supported interpr. of *samaré ’tamānāḥ*; we are free to interpret that phrase differently and, with the supposed rival poet-competitors removed from the passage, to concentrate on the real competition -- that between the poet and his father, as set out in the second hemistich of this vs.

However, let us first consider the rest of the first half-verse. The poet expresses his ignorance of three things: *tántum ... ótum ... yám váyanti*. Most tr. try to make *tántum* and *ótum* grammatically parallel, either by making them both nouns (e.g., Re “Je ne connais point la lisse ni la trame ...”) or both infinitives (e.g., Thieme “Nicht verstehe ich [die Fäden des Aufzugs] zu spannen, nicht [die Fäden des Einschlags] zu weben.”). This is understandable, since the two terms are identically formed, with full-grade accented root and *-tu-* suffix. However, this morphological identity conceals a difference in usage. *tántu-* behaves like a straight noun: it has nominative forms; it occurs in the plural; it has adjectives modifying it (e.g., IX.83.2 *śócantaḥ ... tántavaḥ*, as well as *tatá-* ‘stretched’ several times) and genitives dependent on it (e.g., IX.73.9 *ṛtásya tántuḥ*). By contrast, outside of this hymn *ótu-* is found only in the clear dative infinitives *ótave* (X.130.2) and *ótavaí* (I.164.5, where in fact acc. pl. *tántūn* is construed with it). I therefore think that *tántum* and *ótum* in this passage are non-parallel, just as the third source of ignorance, expressed in a rel. cl., is not parallel to either of the others. In my view, having three non-parallel objects to the verb *ví jānāmi* makes the bewilderment stronger: it’s not just three different things the poet doesn’t understand, but three categories of things -- which categories of things are expressed by different grammatical categories: a noun, an infinitive, a relative clause (without antecedent). “I do not understand the thread (noun), nor (how) “to weave” (infinitive), nor “what they weave” (rel. cl.). Although *-tum* infinitives are quite rare in the RV (5 stems, acdg. to Macdonell VG §586b, Re GLV §371), I suggest that *ótum* was formed and used here, rather than the already existing dat. inf., to provide this grammatical contrast with apparently identical *tántum*.

Since, contra the standard tr., I do not believe that the subject of the verb *váyanti* refers to rival poets, I must propose a different subject. Here the alternative

possibilities for *átamāna-* and *samará-*, as discussed above, provide the clues, along with a rudimentary understanding (which is all I have) of the weaving process. With the warp threads (*tántu-*) stretched lengthwise on the loom, “wandering” is a pleasingly apt description of the way the weft threads go alternately under and over the warp threads proceeding horizontally, and this mingling of warp and weft could easily be characterized as “a meeting/gathering.” My only uncertainty is the precise identity of the subjects who do the weaving (*váyanti*). Are they the weft threads themselves as they wander over and under? Are they the human weavers, or their fingers, manipulating the weft threads? Or some technological substitute like shuttles (I have no idea if this technology was known or used in Vedic India)?

Of course, since the weaving in this verse is metaphorical for poetic composition, ultimately the subjects of *váyanti* must underlyingly be poets — those who do know how and what to “weave.” But my point here is that the imagery of weaving is carried further than the standard brahmodya interpretation allows: the wandering and the coming together refer to the weaving process, not to a putative poetic competition. Moreover, with the contest interpr. banished, the underlying poets need not be guys physically present in the next room, as it were, polishing their verses; they can be any poets in the tradition. Which brings us to the father.

The second hemistich contains two sets of polarized terms: *putrá-* / *pitár-* ‘son’ / ‘father’ and *pará-* / *ávāra-* ‘above’ / ‘below’. (That *pará-* and *ávāra-* make up a polarized pair is clear from numerous passages in which they are contrasted [e.g., I.164.17, X.88.17].) The case assignment in the text, nominative for the first of each pair, instrumental for the second, makes it clear that it is the son who is above, the father below, although this is the counterintuitive pairing. As noted in the publ. intro., despite his professed ignorance of poetic craft, the young poet feels that he must not only equal but surpass his father, to further the poetic lineage. That *pará-* can mean not only ‘higher’ but also ‘further’, while *ávāra-* means both ‘below’ and ‘nearer’, allows the sense of “furthering” the line also to be read in the passage. The father is close by, both to the poet and the present moment, but the poet himself must go farther, in the future, beyond the model of his father, to speak “what is to be said” (*váktvāni*); it is perhaps ironic that the only other occurrence of *váktva-* in the RV outside this hymn is as a genitive pl. dependent on ‘father’: III.26.9 *pitāraṃ váktvānām* “the father of what is to be said,” referring to Agni. It is a nice touch in our vs. that because ‘father’ is in the instr., it better fits the phonological template of ‘son’ than the direct cases would: *putrá ... pitrā*.

VI.9.3: This vs. is responsive to vs. 2, repeating *pāda* almost verbatim, while transposing it into the 3rd ps. from the 1st and into the positive from the negative. The 2nd *pāda* abbreviates the 2nd hemistich of vs. 2, pulling out the all-important object and verb (*váktvāni ... vadāti*) that had been scattered across two *pādas* in vs. 2. The 2nd hemistich introduces new material — identifying the person who does know what the poet says he doesn’t yet — while replacing the *pará-* / *ávāra-* pair with the almost identical *pāra-* / *avāḥ* ‘below’ [adv.].

The first half-verse with its near identical repetition is straightforward, but, with its repetition of “just he ... he ... he” (*sá íd ... sá ... sá*) as the subj. of ‘knows’ and ‘will speak’, it promises both a resolution to the poet’s anxiety of ignorance in 2ab and an answer to the question “whose son?” (*kásya putráh*) in 2cd.

But though the identity of the “he” of 3ab is surely revealed by the relative cl. in the 2nd hemistich, beginning “who ...” (*yáh*, 3c), the referent is far from clear. There are both an apparent and apparently obvious answer and, in my opinion anyway, a covert but enlightening answer that depends on tricky manipulation of the words as given -- which is, after all, the point of the hymn, to learn the ins and outs of verbal weaving. The standard tr. take Agni as the subject of the whole vs.; he is the one who know the thread and the weaving and can say the things to be said. There is a good, obvious piece of evidence that this interpr. is correct: the subject of the relative clause in c appears to be identified as *amṛtasya gopāh* “the herdsman of the immortal.” This epithet was used of Agni only two hymns previously (VI.7.7); it *seems* to clinch the identification. But note what precedes it: *yá īm cíketat* “who will perceive him/it.” Ge (fld. by Doniger) takes *īm* as referring to the thread, while Re simply ignores it. But Thieme takes *amṛtasya gopāh* as the content of the act of perception, as a quotation: “der ihn (Gott Feuer) erkennt: ‘[Er ist] der Hüter des Lebens,’” with *īm* the obj. of *cíketat* anticipating the revelation of Agni’s role and power in the quote. I find Thieme’s interpr. very persuasive. The one who knows all this is not Agni, but the poet who rightly perceives Agni, who possesses the esoteric knowledge acquired by contemplating the ritual fire and receiving its vision.

Thieme then takes pāda d as referring to the poet-subject of c, but I think we can go one better: d is both a description of the poet, as Thieme takes it, *and* a continuation of the right perception of Agni that the poet received, the second part of the quoted revelation “he is the herdsman of the immortal.” In this latter interpr., Agni “moves about below” (*avás cáran*) as the ritual fire of mortals, but “sees above the other one” (*paró anyéna pásyan*), because he (in the form of smoke) goes to heaven bringing the oblations to the gods. By my rules of placement for *anyá-* (1997, Fs. Beekes), it should be definite here (“the other,” not “another,” as in most interpr.). Here “the other” is quite possibly the sun, which is Agni’s allo-form but also presumably somewhat lower in heaven than the smoke carrying the oblations. In the alternative application of this pāda, to the poet, I differ in some crucial ways from Thieme (whose interpr. I will not present further here). The poet also “moves about below” not only as a mortal on the earth, but also as a son, who in one sense is “below” his father in the lineage. But he “sees above the other,” who is the father whose skills he is trying to best. Though in this pāda both *aváh* and *pára-* refer to the son, whereas in 2cd *pára-* referred to the son and *ávára-* to the father, here the ultimate superiority of the son is triumphantly announced, whereas in 2cd this outcome was in question. The cleverness and intricacy of this 2nd hemistich, esp. immediately following the near verbatim repetition found in the first, is a clear demonstration that the young poet has come into his skills and his poetic heritage.

VI.9.4: As argued in the publ. intro., this vs. is the omphalos of a well-structured omphalos hymn, and it contains the “message” of the hymn: the revelatory vision of Agni immediately before the eyes of the poet. This immediacy is conveyed by the near-deictic pronoun that begins the first three pādas — *ayám* (a), *idám* (b), *ayám* (c) — and also ends the first pāda (*imám*). The immediacy is also conveyed by the abrupt command “look at him” (*páśyatemám*) at the end of the 1st pāda; since the impv. is in the 2nd plural, it cannot be addressed to the poet alone. Instead I suggest that it is the poet speaking, urging his priestly colleagues to behold the revelation that has just come to him. As noted also in the publ. intro., the name Agni does not occur in this verse. In fact, in the whole hymn *agní-* is found only in the first and last vss. (1d and 7b), another reinforcement of the omphalos structure. But every phrase in this vs. is an unmistakable description of Agni, and each could be matched by many similar phrases in Agni hymns. Unlike many omphalos vss., this one is not enigmatic and riddling (save for the omission of the name), but straightforward and obvious, one might say *blazingly* transparent. In this way it captures the poet’s sudden burst of enlightenment, in which he truly *sees* for the first time what is (and has always been) in front of him. As such it can be characterized as an epiphany in the technical sense: although the ritual fire has been there all along, it is only now that the poet sees that the fire is really the god. This divine revelation is underscored by the two occurrences of “immortal” (*jyótir amṛtam* b, *ámartyaḥ* d), taking up the poet’s initial true perception in 3c, where he saw that Agni was “the herdsman of the immortal” (*amṛtasya gopāḥ*).

dhruvá in *dhruvá ā* is ambiguous. The Pp. takes it as nom. *dhruvāḥ*, but modern interpr. differ: Old (ZDMG 55.297 and Noten, with Gr [transl.], Hillebrandt, Pischel) and Thieme opt rather for the loc. *dhruvé*, while Gr (Wö), Ge, and Re follow the Pp. — as do I: *dhruvám* modifying Agni as light (*jyótiḥ*) in the next vs. (5a) seems decisive. The constructions are quite parallel: the “steadfast light” of 5a was also “set down” (*nīhitam*), just as “steadfast (Agni)” was “set down” (*nīṣattāḥ*) in 4c. A loc. interpr. is not out of the question, however.

VI.9.5–7: The last three vss. of this hymn are dominated by play on the syllable *ví*, which is also evident, though recessive, in the first part of the hymn. Starting with 5c every hemistich begins with *ví*: 5c *vísve*, 6a *ví*, 6c *ví*, 7a *vísve*; note also *ví* in the middle of 5d and 6a and beginning 6b. This sequence culminates in 7c *vaiśvānaraḥ*, whose first syllable is phonologically a vṛddhi form of *vi* and whose first member *vaiśva-* is morphologically a vṛddhi derivative of *vísva-*. That the two forms of *vísve* in 5c and 7a are in the syntagm *vísve devāḥ* “all the gods” and the 2nd member of *vaiśvānarā-* is contrastively *-nara-* ‘man’ makes the pattern all the more pleasing. And of course it is Agni *Vaiśvānara* who is the source of the poet’s revelation and therefore the focus of the hymn. The stationing of *vaiśvānarāḥ* at the beginning of the last hemistich of the hymn also forms a ring with the same form at the beginning of the second hemistich of the 1st vs. and reinforces the omphalos structure.

VI.9.5–6: The transference of the properties and powers of Agni to our poet is explicit in these two vss. In 5a Agni is light set down or deposited (*jyótir nīhitam*); in 5b he is “swiftest mind” (*māno jāviṣṭham*). In 6b the poet comments on “this light that has been deposited in (my) heart” (*idám jyótir hṛdaya āhitam yāt*; note the near-deictic *idám* again), and in 6c “my mind goes widely” (*ví me mánaś carati*).

The two vss. are also contrastive. In 5 *all* the gods sharing the *same* mind and the *same* perception (*sámanasaḥ sáketāḥ*) converge on Agni as the *single* focus of their intention or resolve (*ékaṁ krátum abhí ví yanti sādhu*), whereas in 6 the poet vividly describes the dis-integration of his senses, emphasized by the repetition of *ví* ‘widely, apart). But rather than expressing a worrisome loss of physical and mental control, the vs. seems rather to dramatize the exciting expansion of his sensory horizons, the limitless potentials for thought and speech that he now experiences. His ears flying apart (*ví me kárṇā patayataḥ*), his mind moving widely (*ví me mánah carati*) are anticipated by Agni’s mind “swiftest among those flying” (*jāviṣṭham patáyatsu*), and the insistent *ví* in this vs. is given a positive spin by the pattern of *vi*-s leading to *vaiśvānarā-*, as discussed above.

In the omphalos structure this vs. is twinned with vs. 2, where the poet worried about his lack of knowledge and skill; here his mind and body can literally not contain the possibilities. One index to the change in his mental attitude may be shown by the difference in mood between the tentative subjunctive *vadāti* in 2d and the purposeful future *vakṣyāmi* in 6d. Both are in questions, but the first wonders “whose son *will (be able) to speak ...?*” while the latter seems only to question which of the many possibilities he should begin with: “what *shall I say?*” There are only two finite forms of the future to \sqrt{vac} in the RV (plus one participial form), so the choice of this form must be marked here. The other is *pravakṣyāmaḥ* in I.162.1, announcing the recital of the heroic deeds (*vīryāṇi*) of the horse to be sacrificed and therefore functioning exactly like the more common, likewise annuncatory *prá vocam* (e.g., in the famous opening of the Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32.1 *índrasya nú vīryāṇi prá vocam*). The correspondent of this future is found rather often in Old Avestan, where 1st sg. (*fra*) *vaxšiiā* regularly performs the same function of proclamation, as in Y 30.1, 45.1 — perhaps indicating a common IIr. employment of this future as an introducer of formal praise. The use of this form here suggests that our speaker is foreseeing his role as official encomiast and poet of record, not simply casting about for something to say. It is possible that *svid* (*kíṁ svid vakṣyāmi*) contributes to this sense, but I don’t have a good sense of the function of this particle in the RV.

VI.9.7: The final vs. of the hymn forms the outer frame of the omphalos structure with vs. 1. We have already noted the resposion of hemistich-initial *vaiśvānarāḥ* in 1c and 7c and the only two occurrences of the stem *agní-* in 1d and 7b. Another important verbal repetition is *támas-*, the last word of vs. 1, found in 7b in the phrase *támasi tasthivāṁsam* “(Agni,) standing in darkness.” The sentence in which this is found seems an odd way to end a hymn: “all the gods, in fear (*bhiyānāḥ*), offered homage (*anamasyan*) to you, while you were standing in darkness.” Why are the gods afraid and what time period does the augmented imperfect refer to? And why is

this somewhat downbeat statement the real end of the hymn (the last hemistich being a generic request for aid)? I don't have certain answers to these questions, but I think the omphalos structure gives us some guidance. This final vs. seems not simply to circle round to the 1st vs., but in fact to take us to a time (right) before the events depicted in the first vs. In vs. 1 Agni overcame the darkness with his light (1d); here he is still in darkness, before he has become equipped with light, before he has been kindled, in fact. The gods are afraid because they fear he won't light up -- and, reading between the lines, he will only light up if the human ritualists kindle him. Even the gods are dependent on our dawn sacrifice, and, reading further between those lines, our newly minted poet will have a crucial role in making that sacrifice succeed.

The last hemistich has a curious etymological figure, repeated for emphasis: *avatūtáye* (i.e., *avatu ūtáye*) "let him help for help."

VI.10 Agni

VI.10.1: In the lexeme *puró √dhā*, *puráh* serves as a pseudo-preverb; the phrase shows extreme distraction (pseudo-tmesis) here, with *puráh* initial in the 1st hemistich and *dadhidhvam* final in that hemistich. The phrase is then revitalized with *puráh* opening pāda c, thus directly adjacent to its verb though across a hemistich boundary. That the opening words of pāda c, *purá ukthébhiḥ* belong to the clause in the first hemistich is further shown by the abrupt clause boundary and change of subject in the middle of c, clearly signalled by a typical clause-initial sequence of PRN + Wackernagel-position particles, *sá hí naḥ*.

Pāda b has two extra syllables. The meter could be easily fixed by deleting *agním* with no ill effects to sense or metrical structure. This is an old idea (see Old's reff., ZDMG 55.298), but though harmless, it may be better to accept the text as given (see Old, *Noten ad loc.*).

On *suṛktí-* as a secondary bahuvrīhi, meaning 'possessing/receiving (hymns) that possess a good twist', see comm. ad II.4.1. This interpr. as a masc. adj. is imposed by the otherwise unbroken string of acc. sg. masculines: *mandráṃ divyám suṛktím ... agnīm*. In the comm. ad II.4.1 I suggest that it can also have the primary bahuvrīhi meaning 'having a good twist', referring to Agni's curls of smoke and flame. This would also be possible as an alternative or secondary reading here.

I take *adhvaré* as part of the loc. absol. *prayatí yajñé*, contra Ge. (Re seems to ignore the second loc.) Nothing much rides on either choice.

VI.10.2: As was discussed in the publ. intro., this hymn traffics in disappointed expectations and truncated syntax, and this vs. displays both in extreme form. The vs. begins *tám u* "him/it [acc. sg.] PARTICLE." Given that the dedicand of the hymn is Agni and vs. 1 contained a long acc. phrase referring to Agni (though that vs. ended with Agni as nom. subj.), we might expect that *tám* = Agni, and our expectations would be supported by a little formula found in various places in the RV (see Klein, *Particle u*, 67–68):

VIII.95.6	<i>tám u ṣṭavāma yáh</i>	“let us praise him who ...”
VIII.96.6	<i>tám u ṣṭuhi yáh</i>	“praise him who ...”
V.42.1	<i>tám u ṣṭuhi yáh</i>	(ditto)
I.173.5	<i>tám u ṣṭuhi ... yáh</i>	(dito)

as well as variations on it. In our vs., immediately following *u* there is a long interruption, consisting mostly of vocatives addressed to Agni (*dyumaḥ purvaṇīka hotar, ágne*), leaving the *tám* in syntactic suspension. But when we finally reach the end of the hemistich, we encounter a nom. participle *idhānāḥ* ‘being kindled’, which can only refer to Agni. This leaves the initial *tám* doubly unmoored: it can’t refer to Agni, as we’d thought, and it can’t be construed with *idhānāḥ*, which is intransitive and doesn’t take accusatives.

The resolution of one of these problems comes at the beginning of the second hemistich, which opens with the acc. *stómam*, which must be the referent of *tám*. This is a pleasing twist on the formula just noted: the root \sqrt{stu} is preserved, but as a coreferential nominal, not as the verb governing the *tám*. There is also an element of “vertical mantra,” since the elements of the NP *tám stómam* are positioned “vertically” in identical metrical slots.

There is no resolution of the other problem, however: what governs this acc. phrase. *stómam* is immediately followed by the rel. prn. *yám* introducing a dependent clause (and reminding us of the *yáh* in the quoted formula). There is no overt governing verb in the main clause; all we know is that it should have Agni as subject, given the nom. part. *idhānāḥ*. Ge, flg. Sāy. and fld. by Re (in his tr., which reflects neither of his suggestions in the n.), supplies the impv. “hear.” This is of course nothing wrong with the sense of this (“[hear] this praise which ...”), but there is also nothing in context to support it. I have supplied “take to yourself,” assuming a medial form of $\sqrt{dhā}$. There are two pieces of supporting evidence for this. It could be generated (somewhat trickily) from *dadhidhvam*, the impv. in the previous verse. And — rather stronger evidence — a similar expression is found overtly in vs. 6: “you [=Agni] have taken to yourself the well-twisted (hymn)” (*dadhiṣe suvrktīm*), with a medial form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ with Agni as subject and a praise as object. Old’s “nimm ... an” (both ZDMG 55.299 and Noten) coincides with my interpr., but he does not, as far as I can see, provide a motivation for it.

What to do with the rest of the first hemistich, namely *agníbhīr mānuṣaḥ*, is another problem. With Ge I take *mānuṣaḥ* as dependent on *hotar*, despite the distance between them and the fact that *mānuṣaḥ* is accented in a voc. phrase (easily accounted for by the distance). The phrase *mānuṣo hótar-* is common in the RV (e.g., I.180.9, II.18.2, IV.6.11, V.5.7). The instr. *agníbhīḥ* must be construed with the part. *idhānāḥ*, as witnessed by the identical expression in the next two hymns (VI.11.6b, 12.6b), but whether it is an instr. of accompaniment as I take it (“along with the [other] fires”), as apparently also Ge, or a true instrument (e.g., Re “allumé par les feux...”) isn’t certain — though I’m not sure what Re’s “being kindled by the fires” would mean.

The relative cl. of pāda c is in no better shape than the main clause of ab. It too lacks a verb. Though there *is* a finite verb in pāda d, *pavante*, it not only lacks an

accent and therefore can't be part of the rel. cl., but it is also intrans. and cannot take *yám* as object. Moreover, both *asmai* and *mamáteva* present difficulties of their own. Let us begin with *asmai*. It surely refers to the recipient of the praise, which just as surely must be Agni. But Agni is addressed in the extensive vocative phrase in ab, and so he must be present both as 2nd ps. addressee and 3rd ps. recipient in the same sentence. Switch of person even within a syntactic construction is of course not unusual. I have no particular answer to this example of it beyond suggesting that 1) the poet may have lost a bit of track of his referents in this syntactically truncated construction, and 2) *asmai* may also be serving as a near deictic, pointing to “this (Agni) here.” It is barely possible, but I think highly unlikely, that *asmai* refers to another ritual participant, despite Ludwig's interpr. (see Ge n. 2c) “für diesen Opferer.”

mamáteva is presumably to be analyzed, with the Pp., as *mamátā iva*; the resulting *mamátā* is a hapax. It is generally taken as a PN (“like Mamatā”), an interpr. whose strongest support is the vṛddhi deriv. *māmateyá-*, usually a metonymic of Dīrghatamas (I.147.3, 152.6, 158.6, particularly clear in the last passage), which presupposes an underlying PN of this shape. Both the *-eyá-* suffix of *māmateyá-* and the name Mamatā itself suggest that the person may be female. However, there is some direct evidence that a masc. **mamáta-* is found in the Bharadvāja lineage. Cf. VI.50.15 *evā nāpāto máma tāsya dhībhīr / bharādvājā abhī arcanti arkaiḥ* “In just this way the Bharadvājas, the descendants of me, this Mamata, chant with their insightful thoughts, with their chants,” where *māma tāsya* is probably a play on the PN. For disc. see Old, ZDMG 42.211–12 = KISch 580–81, though I do not think the text needs emending. However, our *mamátā* is also most probably a pun, on a *-tā-* abstract built to the gen. sg. of the 1st ps. pronoun; such a stem is attested Epic+ in the sense ‘Selbstsucht, Eigennutz’. In this reading it could be an instr. sg. of the *-tā-* stem, ‘with/in my me-ness,’ in addition to being a nom. ‘like Mamatā’. On these questions see now Mayr, PN 2.1.393. Old (ZDMG 55.298–99) explored the possibility of taking *mamátā* (or *-ta*) as the missing verb of the rel. cl., as did I, but both of us came up short.

It is therefore likely that another verb has to be supplied. Contextually, ‘sing, speak, chant’ vel sim., is likely, and both Ge and Re go in that direction, as do I. Specifically I supply a form of \sqrt{rc} ‘chant’, which takes *sūśám* as obj. on a number of occasions (I.9.10, X.96.2, 133.1); see also VI.50.15 cited just above with the locution *abhī arcanti arkaiḥ*. All three of us assume that the verb is 1st sg, although there is less support for that assumption, since there are no other 1st persons, sg. or pl., in the hymn. The pun “in my me-ness” that I see in *mamáteva* would provide some support for my “I,” but neither Ge nor Re so interprets *mamáteva*.

VI.10.3: This vs. also appears to be deliberately misleading, though less so than vs. 2. It begins *pīpāya sá* “he becomes swollen.” Although $\sqrt{pī}$ ‘swell’ is not a particularly Agnaic verb, it still could be applicable to the ritual fire, and the audience might expect an unidentified subject to be the deity of the hymn. But the second pāda, with

dat. *agnáye* and nom. *víprah*, contravenes our expectations: it is the poet who becomes swollen, as a result of his successful service to Agni.

I would emend the tr. of pāda a: *śrávasā* should be rendered ‘with fame’, not ‘with praise’.

VI.10.5: The usual truncation of instr. pl. *ūtíbhīḥ* (appropriate to final position in Jagatī and in dimeter meters) to sg. *ūtī* in final position of a Triṣṭubh pāda. Cf., e.g., *nṛtamābhir ūtī*# in VI.19.10 versus, e.g., V.40.3 (etc.) *citrābhir ūtíbhīḥ*#. Our own hymn contains an ex. of the full instr. pl. phrase in 3c #*citrābhiḥ ... ūtíbhīḥ ...*#. I consider such truncations to be synchronically generated, providing no evidence for any deep historical practice.

The bahuvrīhi *puruvāja-* is a hapax and may be a play on the poetic lineage *bharādvāja-*, which name appears in 6c.

VI.10.6: Another slightly off expression: with monotonous regularity throughout the RV Agni is described as ‘sitting’ or ‘sitting down’ or ‘made to sit (down)’. Although ‘sit’ in these locutions is always expressed by the root \sqrt{sad} , it still seems odd to characterize the human ritualist as ‘sitting’ (*āsānāḥ*, using the regularized participle to $\sqrt{ās}$, not *āsīnā-*), in a context where we might expect the referent to be Agni.

The expression *dadhiṣe suvrktīm* “repairs” both vs. 1 and vs. 2. In 1a we had the adj. *suvrktīm*, which had to be a masc. referring to Agni and therefore a secondary bahuvrīhi. Here *suvrktī-* has its usual meaning of ‘well-twisted (hymn)’ and is presumably fem. As for *dadhiṣe*, recall that I suggest supplying a medial form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ to govern *stómam* in 2. Here we have the full VP.

VI.10.7: The accent on *inuhí* can easily be explained as contrastive to the immediately following verb *vardháya*.

VI.11 Agni

VI.11.1: Although the vs. seems superficially straightforward, it presents a number of small difficulties. We might start with the meter of pāda c: in order to reach 11 syllables, something has to be distracted. HvN suggest *nāsatiyā*, but this produces a bad cadence: – ∘ ∘ ×. Oldenberg (ZDMG 55.300 and Noten) instead suggests distracting the initial preverb *ā*, which produces an even worse cadence (*-ṇā nāsatiyā* – – – ×). And the third possibility, *nāasatyā*, produces a third type of bad cadence (∘ ∘ – ×). Only if we could read the first vowel of *nāsatiyā* as distracted – ∘ can we fix the cadence, but there is no real license for this.

The first morphological problem is *bādhaḥ* in pāda b. Gr takes it as the acc. pl. of a root noun ‘Treiber, Förderer’, but it is hard to fit this into the passage semantically. Schindler (Rt. nouns) finds the passage unclear and does not commit to a root noun interpr., much less a case form. Scar (346–47) takes it as a root noun, but in the abl. sg. (“aus dem Drängen heraus”), in which he calls a “hoffnungslos obskur” passage -- a characterization that, given the super-abundance of hopelessly

obscure parts of the RV, seems rather overdramatic for this minor conundrum. With Old (ZDMG 55.300), Ge, and Re -- and *pace* Scar (346–47) -- I take *bādhah* as an adverbially used neut. *s*-stem, like (and perhaps truncated from) *sabādhah*, also an adverbially nom.-acc. *s*-stem, which, however, Scar also thinks is an old abl. sg. of the root noun. However, even if Scar should be right, the interpr. of *bādhah* as abl. sg. of a root noun could be adapted to the adverbial interpr. with one further step (as he recognizes): ‘out of urgency’ → ‘urgently’.

The next question is the application of the simile *marútām ná práyukti* and the morphological identity of the last word. To start with the latter, with most interpr. I take it as an instr. **-tī* shortened in pause (or, with a more modern descrip., with loss of its final laryngeal in pause [and here before a vowel beginning the next hemistich]). But what does the hitching up of the Maruts have to do with Agni’s sacrificial performance? My assumption is that the simile is limited to qualifying the adverbial *bādhah* ‘pressingly, urgently’. Since everything the Maruts do is precipitous, no doubt the yoking up of their horses is performed with the same urgency, to get on the road as soon as possible. Both Ge and Re push *prá√yuj* further than I think it should go -- to ‘impulsion, instigation’ (“wie auf Betreiben der Marut” and “à l’instigation des Marut” respectively), a sense that seems distant from the ‘yoke, hitch up’ sense of *√yuj*. I also don’t see that the Maruts would be the ones to set Agni’s sacrificing in motion; they are not even associated with the dawn sacrifice and don’t have much to do with Agni. My “at the hitching up” reads as if it were a locative. Though that tr. was made for English parsing reasons, I might slightly alter it to “with the hitching up.”

In pāda d both Ge and Re (flg. Gr’s interpr.) take *hotrāya* as simply referring to the sacrifice (e.g., “zu unserm Opfer”), but *hotrá-* is elsewhere not the sacrifice, but the office of Hotar or the performance of the Hotar’s duties. My tr. (“turn [various gods] to the Hotar-work”) makes it seem that those gods will perform that office, but, since Agni is the Hotar par excellence (see, e.g., pāda a, also 2a, 6a), it must rather be that Agni is urged to cause the gods to turn towards his own performance of his duties. It might be clearer if the tr. read “toward my Hotar-work.”

VI.11.2: The disposition of the elements in pāda b is not entirely clear. In the publ. tr. I construe *antár* with *mártyeṣu* “(god) among men/mortals” and consider *vidáthā* an acc. of extent of time/occasion “through the rites.” Ge agrees with the first, but supplies a verb to govern *vidáthā*: *sādhan* “der ... die Opfer (zustande bringt),” on the basis of two passages containing this phrase (III.1.18, IV.16.3 *vidáthāni sādhan*). I did not believe then that these two passages constituted sufficient formulaic support for supplying a form of *√sādh*, but now I’m more sympathetic to Ge’s view. But there are also other possibilities. In Agni passages *antár* is often in a lexeme with *√i* or *√car*: ‘go between’ -- usually between heaven and earth or men and gods. Flg. Old and Re, such a lexeme, with the verb of motion supplied, could be construed with *vidáthā*: e.g., Re “(te mouvant) entre les participations-cultuelles.” And, if we take *vidátha-* in its occasional meaning of ‘(cosmic) divisions’, we can follow Thieme (Unters. 43) in his interpr. “zwischen den Verteilungen (Himmel, Luftraum, Erde) ist

er, der Himmlische unter den Sterblichen.” Any of these is, in my opinion, possible, but I will stick with the publ. tr., as involving the least amount of extra manipulation.

Since *vāhnir āsā* is a fairly common locution (see passages assembled by Ge ad I.76.4), instr. *āsā* ‘with the mouth’ is not parallel to instr. *juhvā* ‘with the tongue’, despite grammatical and semantic similarity.

VI.11.3: There are several metrical problems in this vs. Pāda c has the caesura after 3; there seems no way to remedy this, and the rest of the meter is fine. Pāda a is rather more interesting: the Saṃhitā text as given yields 10 syllables; there are two possible distractions: *dhán(i)yā* (HvN’s choice) and *t(u)vé*, but both produce the same bad cadence (˘ – – ×). As Old points out (ZDMG 55.300 and Noten), if we distract neither of these choices, the vs. reads fine until the last word, with an opening of five and *dhiṣánā* taking post-caesura position. (It is worth noting that *dhiṣánā*- is almost always immediately post-caesura, whether after an opening of 4 or of 5.) All that’s wanting to make a fine Triṣṭubh line is a single light syllable preceding *váṣṭi*. Although I would not presume to supply such a syllable (nor does Old), it does seem preferable to allow for a rest here with syncopation, rather than to choose one of the two possible distractions that yield a bad cadence.

The syntax and exact sense of the first hemistich are somewhat unclear. Ge and Re take the pādas together, with *dhiṣánā* as subj. both of *váṣṭi* and of the infin. *yájadhyai* (approx. “the Holy Place wishes to sacrifice in you ...”). I have two objections to this interpr.: 1) as Old (ZDMG 55.300) points out (sim. Re; see below), it is Agni who should be doing the sacrificing (though I.109.4, where *dhiṣánā* presses soma willingly [*uṣatī*] renders this objection less forceful); 2) the *prá* beginning pāda b suggests that there’s an intermediate verb form between *váṣṭi* and the infinitive or at least that there’s a subclausal break at the pāda boundary. Re also notices the 2nd problem indirectly, suggesting in his n. an alternative tr. “elle veut (ceci): qu’(Agni) sacrifie en avant” (with the *prá* presumably represented by “en avant”). My publ. tr. reflects such an intermediate verb form, from a supplied form of $\sqrt{dhā}$, with a form of ‘you’ also to be supplied — with the sense “to (put) (you) forward to sacrifice ...” For $\sqrt{dhā}$ + *yájadhyai* see nearby VI.15.15 *ní tvā dadhūta ródasī yájadhyai* “One should set you [=Agni] down, to sacrifice to the two world-halves.” The locution *dhiṣánā* $\sqrt{dhā}$ is also quite common, aided by real or pseudo-etymological association; cf. III.31.13 ... *dhiṣánā* ... *dhāt*; III.56.6 *dhiṣaṇe* ... *dhāḥ*, IV.34.1 ... *dhiṣánā* ... *ádhāt*; VI.19.2 ... *dhiṣánā* ... *dhāt*; VII.90.3 ... *dhiṣánā dhāti*. However, I am now no longer sure that my objections to the standard tr. are strong enough to merit the additional complexity of my publ. interpr., and I am also disturbed by having to interpr. loc. *tvé* as “in regard to you.” The next hymn contains a passage that strongly encourages construing *tvé* here with *yájadhyai* “to sacrifice in you”: VI.12.2 *ā yásmin tvé ... yákṣat*. I would now alter the tr. here to “For even the wealthy Holy Place longs to sacrifice in you to the gods, to their races, for the singer” -- though I am still bothered by the *prá*.

Another problem in this syntagm is *devāñ jánma*. Old (explicitly, ZDMG 55.300) and Ge (in tr.) take *devāñ* as a gen. pl., a form that could either represent the

survival of a very archaic PIE gen. in *-ōm or the truncation of the standard form *devānām*. I do not think this nec., subscribing to Re's assertion (in n.) "*devāñ jānma* ne comporte pas de désinence abrégée our archaïque, mais signifie «la génération (, à savoir) les dieux»,” with *devān* and *jānma* as parallel acc.

In the second hemistich the referent of the subj., *vēpiṣṭho āṅgirasām ... vipraḥ* is in question. Ge, flg. Sāy., suggests the current poet, and the presence of the singer in b (*gr̥naté*) might support this view. However, his superlative status among the *Āṅgirasas* makes it more likely that it is Agni. Cf. the similar expression in I.127.1 *jyēṣṭham āṅgirasām vipra* “(We call upon you), o inspired poet, as the oldest/most important of the *Āṅgirasas*,” as well as the fairly frequent use of *āṅgirastama*- ‘first/best of the *Āṅgirasas*’ for Agni (I.31.2, 75.2; VIII.23.10, 43.18, 44.8). If Agni is the referent, there has been a switch from 2nd ps. reference (*tvé* in pāda a) to 3rd ps. reference here, but this is hardly novel. See the the next vs. (5).

As disc. ad VI.3.6, I interpr. *rebhā*- not as ‘singer’, but as ‘hoarse/husky-voiced (singer)’, sometimes used of Agni, whose crackling is likened to singing. He is so identified nearby in VI.3.6, and the use of this adj. here is another piece of evidence that Agni is the referent of the subject in this hemistich.

In d *chandāḥ* is taken by Gr as the sole example of suffix-accented thematic *chandā*- (not only in the RV but, acdg. to Whit, Rts., anywhere), beside *chānda*-. Gr glosses our form ‘singend, preisend’ and *chānda*- as ‘glänzend, strahlend’; Ge, by contrast, takes it as an *s*-stem and dismisses the accent: “*chandāḥ* doch wohl für *chāndaḥ*.” Pointing to the suggestive juxtaposition *mádhu chandāḥ* here, a near exact match for the PN *madhuchandah*, to whom the first ten hymns in the RV are ascribed (though the name doesn’t appear in the RV text), he tr. “seine süsse Weise.” Re follows suit (“le doux chant”), with the somewhat cryptic note “*chandāḥ* «qui charme», comme *chāndaḥ*.” (Curiously, Old doesn’t comment.) Although I would like to be able to follow their interpr., with *chandāḥ* an anomalously accented neut. *s*-stem, rather than an *-ā*-stem with Gr, I do not see any way to get the suffix accent redactionally or grammatically. My interpr. again introduces complications, but in this case I think they are necessary to avoid positing arbitrary accent shifts. I would suggest that the form *is* an *s*-stem, derivationally related to neut. *chāndas*- ‘rhythm, meter,’ showing the usual rightward accent shift of adjectival possessive derivatives to neut. *s*-stems -- hence ‘having rhythm’. I wish that the form in the text were *chandās* (*chandā* in sandhi), describing Agni the poet, but it is not. I therefore think it is either a neut. used adverbially (“rhythmically” as in the publ. tr.) or that it qualifies *mádhu* “rhythmic honey,” of the song.

VI.11.4: On *svápāka*- see comm. ad IV.3.2.

Note the switch from 3rd ps. reference (pāda a) to 2nd ps. (b). The 2nd ps. reference continues by default through the rest of the vs., though the publ. tr. appears to switch back to 3rd ps.: (“(anoint) him ...”) for Engl. convenience.

VI.11.5: Old (ZDMG 55.301), fld. by Ge and Re, interprets *vṛñjé* as a *t*-less 3rd sg. passive, rather than as the 1st sg. it appears to be. I do not see the necessity for this.

The same VP is found in I.116.1 (... *bárhīr iva prá vṛñje*), where the 1st ps. interpr. is reinforced by the flg. pāda containing the 1st sg. act. *iyarmi*. Further, in the almost identical pāda VII.2.4 *prá vṛñjate námasā barhír agnaú*, the med. 3rd pl. *vṛñjate* must be transitive with sg. *bárhīh* as obj. The best support (see Old) for a pass. interpr. is that then all 4 pādas in this vs. would begin with a passive (b: *áyāmi*, c *ámyakṣi*, d *ásrāyi*), but in that case we might expect a form *more* parallel to the other three. Although \sqrt{vrj} has no passive aorist attested, there are no morphological or phonological barriers to building **ávarji* (cf. the very common *ásarji* to \sqrt{srj} ‘discharge’). I confess I do not understand the sequence of tense, with pres. *vṛñjé* in the *yád* clause, followed by 3 main clause augmented aorists, but taking *vṛñjé* as a passive does not solve this problem.

I do not understand the semantic difference between *sádman-* and *sádana-*, if there is one.

VI.11.6: As noted above, ad VI.10.2, the phrase *agníbhīr idhānāḥ* is found both there and in the next hymn, VI.12.6. It therefore seems unlikely that *devébhiḥ* should be construed in this collocation, despite its apparent parallelism, and, with Ge and Re, I take it as an instr. of accomp. with *daśasyā*.

My interpr. of the simile in the 2nd hemistich differs from the standard. Ge and Re assume that the comparandum for *vṛjānaṃ ná* is *ámhaḥ*. Given the adjacency of the two expressions, this is reasonable. Ge’s version, however, relies on a somewhat unlikely interpr. (insofar as we understand this root) of *áti* \sqrt{sras} as ‘abstreifen’ (strip off): “... möchten wir die Not wie einen Gürtel abstreifen,” and the notion of “stripping off” *ámhas-* seems odd. Re’s “puissions nous ... glisser hors du défile-étroit comme (hors de l’encerclement (ennemi))” does better with the verb, but requires *vṛjāna-* to have a particular negative sense not elsewhere met with (*pace* his citation of X.27.5). In the publ. tr. I take the simile with *rāyáḥ* .. *vāvasānāḥ* “clothing ourselves in riches,” comparing the wealth we wear with a girthband. For a very similar expression, cf. I.173.6 *sám vivya índro vṛjānaṃ ná bhūmā* “Indra has enwrapped himself in earth, like a circlet,” with the same simile. Although the distance between *rāyáḥ* and the simile might speak against this interpr., it does work better semantically, and the parallel passage provides strong support.

VI.12 Agni

VI.12.1: The ‘goat’ (*todá-*) found in VI.6.6 reappears here, as well as in vs. 3. Thus, 3 of the 5 occurrences of this word in the RV are found in this Agni cycle. In VI.6.6 I argue that the referent of the “great goat” is the sun (see comm. ad loc., sim. I.150.1). Old (ZDMG 55.301, also Noten) thinks the sun is the referent in our passage as well, and, further, he construes the gen. *tódasya* in pāda b with *śociṣā tatāna* in pāda d, on the basis of VI.6.6 *bhānúnā ... todásya ... tatantha*. Although the parallel is suggestive, the distance between the genitive and its supposed governing instr. in our passage seems too far, esp. since the 2nd hemistich begins *ayám sá* “here is he” or “this one here,” a sequence that seems to open a new (though co-referential) clause.

Moreover, in vs. 3 *todā-* seems to refer to or be compared to Agni himself, and so the internal evidence of the hymn favors a connection of the goad with Agni, not directly with the sun. I therefore follow Ge in taking *todāsya* as dependent on *rāt*, which also governs *barhīṣaḥ*. It may be that *rāt ... todāsya* “ruler of the goad” is a phrase like *sūnūḥ sāhasaḥ* “son of strength” (see 1c), where “son of X” is tantamount to X. In the same way “ruler of the goad” may be the equivalent of “the goad” itself. Both the sun (“the great goad”) and Agni are goads because with their appearance at dawn they set the world in motion. Since Agni is often taken as an earthly form of the sun, sharing the same third party identity would not be surprising, with Agni being the lesser of the two by nature.

For Agni as “ruler of the ritual grass,” see VIII.13.4=15.5 ... *asyā barhīṣo ví rājasi*, though the subject there is Indra.

I take *yājadhyaī* as a predicated infinitive (sim. Ge, Re, Keydana [Inf., 171]). The VP *ródasī* √ *yaj* is found elsewhere in this cycle: 11.4 *yājasva ródasī*, VI.15.15 *ní tvā dadhīta ródasī yājadhyaī*, with the same infinitive.

VI.12.2: On *svápāka-* ‘very clever’, also VI.11.4, see comm. ad IV.3.2. As noted there the Pp. analyses this sequence as *sú āpāka-*, though Ge and Re take it as a cmpd ‘having a lovely backside’. Kü (214), however, follows the Pp. analysis (also fld. by Gr), and tr. “von Ferne kommend” (as Gr does). I do not see how a derivation from *āpā(ñ)c-* ‘facing/turned backward’ could yield such a sense, esp. in a non-ablatival formation, and, furthermore, Agni, the most *present* of gods, should not be “coming from afar.” Keydana’s “der du entfernt bist” lacks the ablatival element but still runs afoul of the other problems just noted.

‘Heaven’ (*dyaúḥ*) is the performer of the sacrifice in Agni; the qualification *sarvātātā-iva* “as if in its entirety, in its entirety as it were” is explained, reasonably, by Ge as meaning the gods collectively, with *dyaúḥ* ‘heaven’ equivalent to “die Götterwelt.” Re follows this interpr., suggesting that *sarvātātā* is a variant of *devātātā*. For all the gods performing such sacrifice, see, e.g., X.88.7 adduced by Ge.

In tr. *yajatra* as ‘the means of sacrifice’ I am taking the *-tra-* instrument suffix seriously: Agni as the receptacle and recipient of the oblations is indeed the *means* to sacrifice.

In the publ. tr. the phrase introduced by the em-dash “— you the very clever ...” contains only vocatives, though for ease of English they do not read as vocc.

jāmhas- is found independently only here, but also appears in the bahuvrīhis *kr̥ṣṇá-jāmhas-* (I.141.7) and *raghupátma-jāmhas-* (in nearby VI.3.5). Though *jāmhas-* has no direct cognates and at best a root connection to IE **ǵhengh* ‘go’ (EWA s.v.), the cmpds occur in contexts that limit the semantic realm to birds (to which Agni is compared in both cases, as also here) and that point to a bird body part, pace Gr’s ‘Weg, Gang, Bahn’ -- wings, wing-feathers, or plumage. The question is what the point of comparison between the bird’s *jāmhas-* and three-seated (*triśadhásthā-*) Agni is, if in fact the simile is meant to further characterize that descriptor. Ge plausibly suggests that a bird alighting from flight appears to settle on his two wings and his tail-feathers. Re, by contrast, takes the simile separate from

triṣadhástha- and also interprets *jámhas-* as ‘enjambée’ (stride), though, as he explicitly admits, this involves “renouncing” the meaning ‘plumage’ that he ascribes to the same word in nearby VI.3.5, because “on obtient un sens plus facile” (a very dangerous principle to apply to RVic lexicography!).

With most, I take *yájadhyai* again as a predicated inf. “(you are) to sacrifice,” as in vs. 1. Kü (214) curiously interprets it as passive (“... sind die Opfergaben ... zu opfern”), though, as Keydana (174 n. 171) points out, the nom. *triṣadhásthaḥ* is then left hanging.

VI.12.3: The rel. cl. that begins this vs. cannot span the hemistich, since the verb that ends b, *adyaut*, is unaccented. There is the further problem, long noted (see Old ZDMG 55.302), that the apparently easy application of the initial adj. *téjiṣṭhā* to the next noun *aratīḥ* is problematic, because *aratī-* is masc. (though both Thieme [Unters. 29] and Re are willing to allow a fem. here, and Old toys with this notion). In my view the rel. cl. consists only of the first two words, *téjiṣṭhā yásya*, with *yásya* of course referring to Agni. The rest of the hemistich is couched in the nominative, with descriptors most naturally applicable to Agni (like *aratī-*, which generally has Agni as its referent), and so a syntactic shift must happen between the *yásya* and the following nominatives.

Therefore, a noun must be supplied with *téjiṣṭhā* in the rel. cl., as Old already suggested (ZDMG 55.302 n. 1). His candidates are ‘Glut’ or (in pl.) ‘Flammen’; Ge follows the former suggestion, supplying *tapantī* as in II.23.14. In contrast I suggest ‘course’. As we’ve seen, the Agni cycle of VI is tightly knit, and in VI.3.4 (a hymn with another connection to this one, disc. ad vs. 2) we find *tigmám cid éma ... yásya* “whose course is sharp ...” Of course, *éman-* is a neut. and cannot be supplied with fem. *téjiṣṭhā*, but cf. I.53.8 *téjiṣṭhayā ... vartantī*; *vartantī-* generally means ‘course, track’, though in that particular passage I take it as ‘(wheel)edge’. In any case that fem. would fit here nicely and match the “sharp course” of VI.3.4.

Note that both *(-)rāt* and *todā-* return from vs. 1. As discussed ad vs. 1, *todā-* now seems to apply directly to Agni. I take this word as part of the simile (so also Ge, Re), despite the right displacement of the simile particle, *todó ádhvan ná*, for which I have no explanation.

Hemistich-final *adyaut* echoes *dyaúḥ* at the end of 2b.

In c the first question is the meaning and root affiliation of the hapax *dravitā*. Older interpr. ascribe it to \sqrt{dru} ‘run’: Gr ‘Renner’, apparently (with some attenuation) Ge ‘Ausreisser’, while Re renders it as ‘fondeur’ (smelter), with, presumably, a developed sense of \sqrt{dru} . However, the set character of the agent noun makes this problematic, and Hoffmann (MSS 10 [1957] 70 = Aufs. 420) convincingly connects it with his set root $\sqrt{drū}$ ‘cut, reap’ -- an ascription that has been followed essentially by everyone since (e.g., EWA s.v. *DRAV*’, Gotō 1st Kl., 138–39, Tichy Nom.Ag., 35, 285, Keydana Inf., 194 n. 18). The adj. characterizing this agent noun, *adroghá-*, is unexpected. It ordinarily means ‘undeceptive’ and qualifies speech (as in the bahuvrīhi *ádrogha-vāc-*), but “undeceptive reaper” is puzzling. I pushed the adjective further than it should probably go, to ‘undisguised’, which, in

conjunction with *tmán* ‘in person’, may express that Agni’s role in cutting down plants is plainly evident to all. But the locution still seems awkward. Tichy’s ‘zuverlässig’ (trustworthy, reliable) mitigates some of this awkwardness and does not stray too far from the sense of the adj.; I would be inclined to emend my tr. to ‘trustworthy’.

In d *avartrá-* is likewise a hapax. It appears to be a bahuvrīhi built to *vártra-* (AV+) ‘dam, dike’; see Debr’s Nachtr. to AiG II.1 (p. 58).

VI.12.4: The first hemistich is partly assembled from material also found elsewhere: the quite straightforward 2nd pāda is identical to VII.12.2b. The post-caesura portion of the first pāda, *etārī ná śūṣaīḥ*, is also found at V.41.10, where the pre-caesura portion, *gr̥ñtē agnīḥ* ‘Agni is sung’, is functionally identical to our 2nd pāda (esp. *agnī ṣṭave* ‘Agni is praised’). On *etārī* as a loc., see comm. ad V.41.10; note that this word is a partial anagram of 3a *vanerāt*.

In c note the insistent phonetic figure: dr(ú)**vanno vanván** krát(u)**vā ná árṡā**.

The interpr. of pāda d is difficult because of the highly unusual form *jārayāyi*, which has been much discussed (see esp. Old ZDMG 55.302–3). Since the hemistich otherwise lacks a verb form, it is tempting to see a verb here. But the accent makes trouble because this is a main clause with no syntactic break evident before the word. Nonetheless, it is generally taken as a nonce aor. passive and quite possibly a punning one: as a denom. to *jārā-* ‘wooer, lover’ (hence ‘become a wooer’) and as a pass. built to the caus. *jāráyati* (/ *jaráyati*) ‘awaken’. The pun is most clearly expressed in Ge’s tr. “wie der Vater des Uṣas zum Buhlen ward, so wurde er durch die Opfer erweckt”; he takes it as referring to the myth of incest of Heaven, also signalled by the phrase *usrāḥ pitéva* “like the father of Dawn.” Although I am always game (perhaps too game) to see puns everywhere in the RV, I am dubious about the one suggested here. For one thing the somewhat anomalous stem *uṣár-/usr-* is never used for personified Dawn, but only for the temporal dawn. (For supposed voc. *uṣar* in I.49.4 see comm. ad loc. and Lundquist 2014.) It seems unlikely that the stem typed for the goddess, *uṣás-*, would not be used in this myth where her identity is so very crucial. Moreover, I rather doubt that *usrāḥ* here is a gen. sg. with *pitéva*. Not only is the simile particle wrongly placed (though this is not rare), but *usrás* is almost always an acc. pl., which can express extent of time (e.g., VII.15.8). The solution I favor for *jārayāyi* is one also mentioned by Old, stemming from Ludwig, and endorsed by Debrunner in the Nachtr. to AiG I [p. 163] -- that it belong to a gerundive stem *jārayāy(i)ya-* ‘to be awakened’ and the expected nom. sg. **jārayāy(i)yaḥ* lost its final syllable by haplology before *yajñāīḥ*, not surprisingly in this *y(a)*-rich environment. This gerundive is predicated and serve in lieu of a finite verb. For a similarly formed predicated gerundive, see nearby *trayayāy(i)yaḥ* at VI.2.7.

VI.12.5: With *tákṣat* we can supply *vánā* on the basis of I.127.4, as noticed by the standard comm.

ṛṇá- is otherwise neut., meaning ‘debt’ (Gr’s supposed fem. *ṛṇā* in X.127.7 is actually a neut. pl.) I am inclined to assume that this masc. nom. sg. is a nonce application.

The last word of the vs., *rāṭ*, seems to reprise the similarly pāda-final *rāṭ* in 1a and *vanerāṭ* in 3a, but because it is unaccented, it must be a verb form belonging to $\sqrt{rāj}$ ‘go straight’.

VI.12.6: In the first pāda as transmitted (metrically faulty), there is a hapax *nídāyā(h)* supposed built to a fem. *nídā-* ‘scorn’. There is no verb to govern this word, so “protect” vel sim. must be supplied. Ge adduces nearby VI.14.5 *nídāḥ ... uruṣyāti*, while Gr suggests II.34.15 *nídó muñcátha*. I am somewhat more sympathetic to these makeshifts than I was when I produced the publ. tr., but the fact remains that protection from scorn is rather intrusive in the passage, in a hymn that focuses almost exclusively on Agni’s travel and speed. In the publ. tr. I suggest a different analysis of the sequence: *arvann íd *āyāḥ*, resegmenting the Pp. analysis and taking *āyā(h)* to $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘drive here’. This requires an alteration of the Saṃhitā text by accenting *āyāḥ*. The posited verb form could be an impf., pres. injunc., or subj. to the root pres. to this root, or an indic. or injunc. to the *s*-aorist. Since no other such forms occur unambiguously in the RV, it could have been reanalyzed and lost accent. For a possibly similar form see *yā(h)* in V.33.2 and comm. ad loc. Although the particle *íd* would be slightly oddly positioned after a voc., it is fairly regular in pre-verbal position when the verb is final in its pāda (e.g., in this maṇḍala VI.19.13 *śátroh-śatoror úttara út syāma*, 42.3 *dhṛṣát tám-tam íd éṣate*, 45.7 *yó gṛnatām íd āsitha*). Note also the phonetic figure closing a and b: *nídāyā(h)# ... idhānáḥ#*, which would be stronger if the first was *ídāyā(h)*.

VI.13 Agni

VI.13.1: The voc. *ágne* was omitted from the publ. tr.

Although *śruṣṭī* can represent nom. sg. *śruṣṭiḥ* and is so taken by Ge, Re (and seriously entertained by Old), I accept the traditional analysis as instr. sg. (allowed by Ge in n. 1c); elsewhere the instr. sg. form is almost always pāda-initial as here, whereas the rare nom. sg. never is. The point seems to be that Agni listens to us attentively and subsequently metes out rewards.

VI.13.2: As usual, the form *iṣé* is subject to multiple possible analyses, but most interpr. opt for a dat. of *iṣ-* ‘refreshment’, as do I. With most (but not Old), I split pāda a into two nominal clauses, based on the apparently clause-initial sequence *ā hí* after the caesura. The enclitic *naḥ* must of course belong properly to the 1st clause, though it can be understood with the 2nd as well.

In pāda b, the referent in the simile qualified as *párijmā* ‘encompassing’ has been variously identified: Ge (sim. Lü) Vāyu, Re the sun or Agni solaire, Gr Agni himself. By contrast, I supply ‘household’ (*gáya-*), on the basis of nearby VI.2.8, where Agni is said to be *párijmeva ... gáyāḥ* “encompassing like a household” (on

which see comm. ad loc.). This simile would play on Agni's well-known connection to the domestic sphere. The point of comparison is that the household is the unit that controls the wealth of its members. I supply "over treasure" on the basis of *rátanam* in pāda a; *kṣayasi* in b needs a gen. complement to parallel the simile in c: *mitró ná brhatá rtáśya*.

VI.13.4: The sequence *vedyānaṭ* is emended by Old (ZDMG 55.304 and Noten) to *védyānaṭ* with two accents (that is, underlying *védyā* or *védī* 'with the altar' + *ānaṭ*). He convincingly adduces nearby VI.1.10 *védī sūno sahaso gīrbhir ukthaiḥ*, identical to our pāda a save for the first word. See comm. ad loc. The standard interpr. read *vedyā* (Ge, Re, Lub, etc.) with the Pp and render as 'with wisdom' vel sim. It's worth noting that *vedyā-* is otherwise only plural, an argument about ascribing our sg. form to that stem.

With Ge I think *prāti vāram* should be construed together, even though the standard expression is *prāti vāram* (II.11.21, etc.). Re suggests a haplology from **prāti vāram vāram*, but this seems unnecessarily complex. I consider *vāram* from **vāram* a minor metrical adjustment to fit a Triṣṭubh cadence. And see immed. below for another possible lengthening.

Ge takes *dhānyā-* as 'grain', a deriv. of *dhānā-* 'id.'. Certainly the other occurrence of *dhānyā-* does have this meaning (V.53.13; cf. also *dhānyākṛt-* X.94.13), but here a deriv. of *dhána-* 'wealth' makes more sense (see Re's 'richesse'). Old suggests emending to *dhānyam*, which exists in this meaning, but I don't see the need for this. Why not simply take it as a (nonce) *-ya-* suffixed vṛddhi deriv. of *dhána-* (on such formations see AiG II.2.834ff.), since vṛddhi derivatives are fairly prominent in this hymn (*saubhagāni* 1a, *sauśravasā* 5a)?

VI.13.5: Despite their distance from each other, the two datives *nṛbhyaḥ ... puṣyāse* seem to form a de facto infinitive phrase: "for men to thrive" -- although it is certainly possible to construe them as separate datives with *dhāḥ* "establish (goods) for men, (goods) for thriving."

I supply 'goods' with the neut. pl. adjectives *sauśravasā suvīrā*, on the basis of *vasavyaiḥ*, the last word of the preceding vs. (sim., Re "[choses]"). It would also be possible, with Ge, to take *sauśravasā* as a substantive: "Diese Ruhmesherrlichkeiten." Cf. also Thieme (Fremdl., 47).

On first encounter the sentiment of cd is unsettling. What the text seems to say -- and what I think it does say -- is that Agni provides good things for the archetypal pair of inimical creatures, the wolf (*vṛka-*) and the stranger (*arí-*). (For the pairing, see, e.g., nearby VI.15.3, where Agni is asked to keep us free of them.) It seems even worse that what Agni provides in our vs. is "an abundance of livestock" (*bhūri paśvāḥ*; cf. nearby VI.1.12) that becomes *vāyas-* ('vigor, vital energy') for those creatures: in other words he deprives human communities of their domestic livestock in order to feed hungry wild beasts and outlaws. There have been two basic responses to this apparent breach of the divine/human compact. Acdg. to Old (ZDMG 55.305), since Agni provides even for the wolf and so on, he should most

definitely provide at least as much for us. Ge more or less follows this interpr. (see n. 5d), as do I. It is supported by a similar passage in an Aśvin hymn, VII.68.8 (also adduced by Ge) *vṛkāya cid jāsamānāya śaktam* “Do as you are able, even on behalf of a wolf that is worn out.” Note the *cid*, which is unfortunately missing in our passage. (Cf. also VI.45.2 *avipré cid váyo dádhat* “placing vitality even in the uninspired,” with the VP *váyah* √*dhā* as here and a *cid*.) By contrast, Thieme (Fremdl., 47), fld. by Re, interprets the dat. phrase *vṛkāyāráye jásuraye* not as a dative of benefit, but of malefit, as it were: “...wenn du gross machst die Lebenskraft des Viehs durch deine Stärk für den (i.e. zur Verteidigung gegen den) Wolf, den Fremdling, der verschmachtet.” The slipperiness of glossing “for” as “for defense against” seems unacceptable to me, a clear instance of allowing our contextual expectations to trample the grammar. Th also severs the little formula *bhūri paśvāḥ* (found in nearby VI.1.12, as already noted, as well as III.54.15), taking the gen. *paśvāḥ* with *váyah* (“die Lebenskraft des Viehs”) and *bhūri* as part of a phrasal verb with *kṛṇóṣi* (“wenn du gross machst”). Re’s interpr. basically follows Th’s, with some curlicues of its own.

Although Th/Re produce a more acceptable sense, they do so at the expense of the clarity of the grammar, which is supported by a number of parallel passages. I think we must accept that Agni is providing for these undesirables. It might be worthwhile to speculate about what the real world analogue might be. Here I suggest (with no certainty at all) that this might be a forest fire. MBh I.217–19 depicts the horrific burning of the Khāṇḍava Forest, in which most of the animal denizens of the forest were killed in the conflagration and those that tried to escape were cut down by men stationed at the perimeter. Although in the MBh account there is no difference between prey animals and their prey -- they all perish -- it does suggest an analogue, that wolves and outlaw men might capitalize on the panic roused by a forest fire to capture easy pickings. An internet search turns up a passage in J. F. Bendell, “Effect of Fire on Birds and Mammals” (in *Fire and Ecosystems*, ed. T. T. Kozlowski, 1974), 75: “many birds and mammals are attracted by fires, probably to feed upon prey driven from their homes. Komarek (1969) mentioned species of birds in Australia, Africa, and North America that come to and hunt in front of fires.”

On the meter of d see Old ZDMG 55.305 and Noten.

VI.13.6: Both Ge and Re separate pādas a and b, and Ge’s tr. seems at least potentially to take the subj. of a, *vadmā*, as non-coreferential with Agni (“Ein Redner ... (werde) uns ... zuteil”), but since *vadmán-* occurs only here and in nearby VI.4.4, where it definitely refers to Agni, I do not see the point.

A factor influencing the Ge/Re separation of the pādas may be the apparent presence of enclitic *naḥ* in both pādas: ... *no víhāyā(h)ḥ* / ... *no dāḥḥ*. However, the second *naḥ* should almost certainly be read as the final syllable of the preceding *vājī*, thus **vājínah*, acc. pl. of *vājín-*, a possibility floated by Ge in n. 6b. Note only does this reading eliminate the pleonastic enclitic, but it also eliminates the only supposed neut. nom./acc. sg. to *vājín-*, which would be required to modify neut. *tókam* (e.g., Ge “siegestekrönten leiblichen Samen”). A change is only required in the Pp.; the

Samhitā text is undisturbed. An asterisk should be inserted in the publ. tr. before “prize-winning.”

The seemingly late position of *naḥ* in pāda a, before the final word *vīhāyāḥ*, is actually not so late after all: it can count as (modified) Wackernagel’s position, after an accented initial word (*vadmā*) followed by the phrasal vocative *sūno sahasaḥ*.

VI.14 Agni

VI.14.1: This vs. is beset with small difficulties, which add up. To begin with, what should be done with *dúvaḥ* in the first pāda? Since the first hemistich has only a single expressed verb, *jujóṣa*, the question is whether both *dúvaḥ* ‘friendship’ and *dhīyam* ‘insight’ are objects of this verb. Re (flg. Gonda) takes the two nouns as appositional and both objects of *jujóṣa*: “Le mortel qui a-toujours goûté en Agni le privilège (de) la vision-poétique,” but this depends on his particular interpr. of *dúvas-* and, even with that, doesn’t make a lot of sense to me. Ge in his n. 1ab calls *jujóṣa* a Zeugma, which I think *ought* to mean that both nouns are its object, with slightly different senses of the verb -- but in fact he supplies a separate verb with *dúvaḥ*: “Welcher Sterblicher Agni die schuldige Achtung (erweist) und mit seinen Gedanken gern (seiner) gedenkt.” Since he seems to take *dhīyam jujóṣa* as a phrasal verb “gern (seiner) gedenkt” [think well of him, vel sim.], he may be using Zeugma in a different sense (unless he’s taking “erweist” as a different sense of *jujóṣa*). But I do not see submerging the distinct sense of $\sqrt{juṣ}$ ‘taste, enjoy’ into an anodyne idiom with *dhī-*, ‘think well of’, and I don’t see how he could get that out of the two words that go into it. In the publ. tr. my solution to the *dúvaḥ* problem was to supply a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ as in IV.8.6 (also adduced by Ge), I.4.5, VII.20.6, all with acc. *dúvas-* + LOC, as here. It would also be possible to supply a form of \sqrt{kr} , as in III.16.4, IV.2.9, VIII.31.9 with the same complements. However, the two hymns following this one each contain a form of \sqrt{van} ‘win’ with *dúvas-* as obj.: VI.15.6, 16.18, and I would therefore change my tr. to “(has won/wins) friendship in/by Agni.”

In the second pāda we encounter two closely related stems: the root noun *dhī-* as object of *jujóṣa* and the instr. *dhītībhiḥ* to the *-tí-* stem to the same root, and some distinction must be meant. In my opinion, *dhītí-*, esp. in the plural, are generally the insightful thoughts of the human poet, whereas *dhī-* can be the insight that gods bestow on that very poet and that gives rise to his *dhītí-*, and those two values are found in our passage: the poet savors the *dhī-* that Agni provides him, which is manifested in the poet’s *dhītí-*.

The second hemistich presents more problems, beginning with the first word: *bhásan* is analyzed by the Pp. as *bhásat*, hence as a finite verb form -- either an injunc. to a thematic stem *bhása-* (so Gr, Macd VGS, tentatively Whitney Rts) or the subjunctive to a root aor. (so Gotō, 1st Kl, 82; also EWA s.v. *BHAS*¹). This is not impossible, but I take the underlying form to be the same as the sandhi form, *bhásan*, and, with Old (ZDMG 55.305–6, Noten), identify it as a pres. part. nom. sg. masc. This analysis assumes that the stem is thematic; a root aor. participle should be **psán* (though one wonders how long that would last). In any case, taking it as a finite form

would not appreciably change the meaning of the hemistich; in that case I would alter the tr. to “he chews/will chew it now; he should ...”

The pāda-medial sequence *X nú śá prá* is somewhat puzzling, since both *śá* and *prá* seem out of place. Gr takes *prá* with *bhāsan*, but I think it goes more naturally with *vr̥ita*, though in either case the position of the preverb is odd. I’m also not sure what, if anything, the retroflexion of *śá* after *nú* is telling us. I have found no other examples of this sequence, though cf. VIII.27.18 with ... *páro nú sā#*, without retroflexion.

The next question is what \sqrt{bhas} ‘bite, chew’ is doing in this context. Ge tr. “der soll zuerst den Mund auftun,” remarking in his n. 1c that it means something like ‘yawn, gape’ -- but he doesn’t explain what this means in context. Both Old and Re supply “enemies” as obj. (e.g., Old “... möge (seine Feinde) zermalmend”); this makes somewhat more sense, esp. given the hostile sentiments later in the hymn. But I think it can be better integrated into the context of the vs. in which it’s found. The vs. has a sequence of verbs $\sqrt{juṣ}$ ‘taste, savor, enjoy’ -- \sqrt{bhas} ‘bite, chew’ -- $\sqrt{īsam}$ $\sqrt{vr̥}$ ‘choose (as) refreshment / nourishment’, all centering on eating. In my view they all take the same object, *dhīyam*, and all metaphorically refer to the mortal poet’s eating the insight that Agni has conferred on him -- that is, consuming it and turning it into his own substance. It is a striking image.

VI.14.3: As discussed ad IV.48.1 and VI.1.5, I take the phrase *rāyo aryāḥ* “the riches of the stranger” here and in IV.48.1 (cf. also VI.47.9) and the phrase *rāya ubhāyāso jánānām* “both the riches of the peoples” in VI.1.5 as referring metaphorically to people, as the most valuable resource of a society. In our passage there are three different parallel designations for these same people: “the clans of Manu” (*mānuṣo víśaḥ*) understood from the last pāda of the previous vs. (2d), “the riches of the Ārya” (pāda b), and “the Āyus” (*āyávaḥ* in c). To make matters more complex, these people are not only contending among themselves -- that is, divided and engaging in internal conflict -- but are also fighting united against common enemies, namely the Dasyu (*dāsyum*) and one without commandment (*avratām*), as was already seen by Ge (n. 3). This is the usual “fission and fusion” model of Rigvedic society, as discussed at length by Proferes (2007, esp. Chap. 2). The internal conflict is expressed in the first hemistich by the reciprocal verb *spárdhante* ‘they contend with each other’, while the second hemistich concerns their joint enterprises, expressed by the participles *tūrvantaḥ* ‘overcoming’ and *sīkṣantaḥ* ‘seeking to vanquish’.

VI.14.4: The hero whom Agni bestows here is the concrete realization of the help (*avas-*) sought in vss. 1 and 3.

The standard interpr. (though not Gr) construe *śávasaḥ* with *bhiyā* “with fear of his vast power.” This is certainly possible, but a construction with *saṃcákṣi* seems equally possible and the adjacency of the two words (though across a pāda boundary) very weakly supports my interpr.

VI.14.5: By my interpr. *rayīḥ* here has the same metaphorical sense as *rāyāḥ* in 3, namely manpower, or perhaps more narrowly the hero given by Agni in 4. Both Ge and Re take *sahāvā* ‘victorious’ as an epithet of Agni, despite the hemistich boundary. This is presumably because the adj. is felt to be more appropriate for an animate being than for wealth -- but this problem disappears if we take wealth figuratively for manpower. (They may also unconsciously take the 2nd position of *yāsya* in c as an indication that the rel. cl. begins there, though of course they regularly interpret 2nd position relatives correctly.) The repeated adj. *āvṛtaḥ* is also better applied to an animate being (4x of Indra, once [oddly] of barhis), and it must belong to the rel. cl.

VI.15 Agni

VI.15.1: The problematic pāda here is c: *divāḥ, kác cid*, and *ā* are difficult to construe and interpret. Ge takes the first as referring to ‘day’ rather than ‘heaven’ and makes it dependent on *kác cid*: “zu jeglicher Zeit des Tages,” but *divāḥ* is far more often ‘heaven’ than ‘day’ (the latter sense usually confined to use with *trír ā* and a few temporal adverbs). Re takes *divāḥ* as an abl. of ‘heaven’ (“Il s’avance du ciel”), and he takes the *kác cid* adverbially with *jānuṣā ... śúciḥ* (“pur de toute manière quant à la naissance,” where the indefinite sense of *kác cid* has been replaced by a totalizing one). In the publ. tr. I agree with Re in taking *divāḥ* as ablative of ‘heaven’, construing it with distant *ā*, and supply ‘food’ with *kác cid*. But I now don’t think this makes much sense. I will suggest an alternative that makes more sense, but that doesn’t solve all the difficulties and requires some special pleading.

First I’d observe that the word order in this pāda seems particularly contorted. I ascribe this to the position of *jānuṣā*: this instr. occurs 20 times in the RV and it always occurs immediately after the caesura, whatever its function in the clause. In this particular case, it is generally agreed that *jānuṣā* should be construed with *śúciḥ* (see Ge’s n. 1c), despite the intervening material. I’d argue that the need to plunk down *jānuṣā* smack in the middle of the pāda has disrupted the constituencies of the rest of the pāda as well. Therefore, we cannot use word order and adjacency as reliable guides here (even less so than in the rest of the RV).

Now, let’s start with the verb *véti*, which opens the pāda, and with the observation that the poet of this hymn is supposed to be Vītahavya, who is in fact mentioned in both the other vss. of the *tr̥ca* (2c, 3d). If we decompose this cmpd. name we can make a putative *havyám* ‘oblation’ the object of *véti* (cf. I.74.4 *véṣi havyāni*; sim. III.53.1, VI.60.15, etc.; for similar gapping in this hymn, see 14b), which can be qualified by *kác cid*: “he pursues any (oblation) whatever.” I further suggest that *divāḥ* should be construed with *ā*, as in my publ. interpr., but that here *ā* means ‘all the way to X’, rather than ‘from X here’. Although in the ‘all the way to’ sense, *ā* normally precedes the ablative (see Gr, s.v. *ā*), as already noted, the word order in this pāda seems particularly scrambled, and, in any case, *ā* often follows an acc. in the ‘to’ sense. I would therefore now substitute the tr. “Just he, blazing from birth, pursues any oblation whatever all the way to heaven.” This would be a

description of the flames rising up towards heaven as they carry the oblation up to the gods.

The next pāda is implicitly contrastive: although the flames of the ritual fire actively reach for heaven in pāda c, the fire itself, just kindled, starts by burning the kindling sticks, which are immovable as opposed to the oblation later poured into the fire.

The cadence of d is bad.

VI.15.2: The first hemistich treats Agni in the accusative, so that no grammatical person needs to be expressed. It therefore appears to continue the 3rd ps. of vs. 1, but modulates to the 2nd ps. reference of cd.

VI.15.4: As noted in the publ. intro., this initial vs. of the 2nd ṛca is a variant on the 1st hemistich of the 1st ṛca: in their first pādas an opening of 5 ending in *vo* is followed by *ātithim*; the end of the 2nd pāda of vs. 1, *ṛñjase girā*, is reprised by 4cd ... *suvṛktībhiḥ*, ... *ṛñjase*.

VI.15.5: In b both Ge and Re take *uṣāsaḥ* as a nom. pl. rather than a gen. sg. as I do (e.g., “commes les aurores avec leur rayon”). Either would work contextually. However, in IV.1.17 in the phrase *uṣāso bhānūḥ* (like our *uṣāso ná bhānúnā*), *uṣāsaḥ* has to be gen. sg. and Ge so interprets it there.

In c and d I take the crucial terms with double reference, in both simile and frame. In c this term is the pres. part. *tūrvan*: in the frame it refers to Agni and is construed with loc. *yāman* “going in triumph on his course”; in the simile it is construed with loc. *rāṇe* “like the victor in the battle.” The battle with (lit. of) Etaśa is a reference to the conflict between Indra and the Sun involving the Sun’s horse Etaśa in some unfortunately puzzling way.

nū in c seems to have no function and is curiously positioned, though it might be noted that there’s a minority position of *nū/nū*, penultimate in the pāda, and this is fairly common in VI.

As for d, the standard interpr. (Old ZDMG 313 + Noten, Ge, Re) take the part. *taṛṣṇānāḥ* only with the simile; this requires supplying an elaborate verbal predicate (“goes to water”) that is not found in the Sanskrit; cf., e.g., Old “er der herbei (eilt) wie im Sonnenbrand der Durstende (zum Wasser eilt).” I again think that the participle applies in both simile and frame: in the simile it refers to someone becoming thirsty in the (sun’s) heat, whereas in the frame it refers to Agni “thirsting” for oblations. This participle is used unambiguously of Agni elsewhere (I.31.7, II.4.6) in describing his voracious appetite for fuel.

In a clever poetic trick the sun is referred to indirectly in both c (his horse Etaśa) and d (his heat: *ghṛṇā*-).

VI.15.6: The locatival inf. *grñīṣāṇi* occurs only here and in VIII.12.19. Curiously, in both passages it is construed with *āmreḍitas*: here *priyām-priyam ... ātithim* (matching *agnīm-agnim* in pāda a), in VIII.12.19 *devām-devam ... indram-indram*. I

don't quite know what to do with this fact. Keydana (p. 178) takes it as a "Matrixinfinitiv" functionally equivalent to an imperative, pointing to impv. *duvasyata* in pāda a. However, it would also be possible to interpret it as I do, with *duvasyata* the main verb of both pādas and the infinitive an adverbial adjunct to both pādas. I would change the tr. of the *āmreḍitas*, however, to one more in harmony with that in VIII.12.19: "Time after time do friendly service to the fire with a kindling stick, time after time to your dear guest, in hymning (him)."

The morphology of *gr̥ṇīṣāṇi* is of course unusual, though it belong with the small group of RV *-san-i* locatival infinitives, some of which (cf. esp. *upastr̥ṣāṇi*) are built to already derived verbal stems (see AiG II.2.924–25). In this passage it phonologically echoes *ghṛṇé* and *tatr̥ṣāṇāḥ* in the preceding vs. (5d), and in the next vs. (which also belongs to the next *tr̥ca*) pāda-final *gr̥ṇe*, which is also of course etymologically related.

VI.15.7: This vs. begins a new *tr̥ca*, but seems like a mish-mash of the vss. that precede it. The 1st pāda, *sámiddham agnīm samídhā girā gr̥ṇe*, telescopes vs. 6: *agnīm-agnim ... samídhā* (a), *gr̥ṇīṣāṇi* (b), *gīrbhiḥ* (c). It also contains two etymological figures (*sámiddham ... samídhā* and *girā gr̥ṇe*). The next pāda, *śúcim pāvakām puró adhvaré dhruvām*, is more eclectic in its sources: *śúciḥ* (1c), *pāvakáyā* (5a), *svadhvarām* (4b); pāda-final *dhruvām* has no direct correspondent, but resonates with both *dúvaḥ* (pāda-final in 6e) and *adrúham*, which ends the next pāda (7c). The first two words of pāda c, *vípram hótāram* have correspondents in 4c and b respectively. Only pāda d breaks significantly new ground.

VI.15.9: The publ. tr. fails to tr. *dūtó devānām*. The tr. should be emended to "... as messenger of the gods, you speed ..."

The lexeme *ví√bhūṣ* occurs only here and I.112.4 until Epic, and it is not entirely clear what it means here. "Seeking manifestation" of the publ. tr. depends on the usage of rare *ví√bhū*, which can mean 'become manifest'; an example is found (at least by my lights) in vs. 14. But it might have the less marked meaning 'becoming conspicuous, distinguished' or 'becoming extended/extensive'. In any case it picks up *vibhūm*, which opens the last pāda of the preceding vs. Note also the polarized preverbs *ví* and *sám* at opposite ends of the hemistich.

The Pp. takes *ubháyāṁ* as acc. pl. masc. *ubháyān* (so also Gr), but as Old suggests (ZDMG 55.313, Noten), it could be neut. pl. *ubháyā* with nasalization in hiatus, and a neut. pl. construed with *vratā* is an attractive choice here. The phrase *ubháyā(ṁ) ánu vratā* "following both (kinds of) commandments" would of course refer to those of gods and men, who were mentioned in 8c.

VI.15.10: This vs. is rhetorically pleasing, though unremarkable in content. It opens with three cmpds with *su-* as first member, all in the realm of appearance (at least as I interpret the sequence) *suprátīkam suḍṛśam s(u)vāñcam*. The next pāda juxtaposes a negated form of the pf. part. of *√vid* with a comparative built to the same stem (though different allomorph), *ávidvāṁso vidúṣṭaram*, picked up by a third form to

this participle, *vidvān*, at the end of the next pāda -- which itself participates in an alliterative sequence *vísivā vayúnāni vidvān*.

svāñc- of course patterns and inflects with the *-añc-* stems, generally built to preverbs/adverbs in the meaning of ‘directed’ (e.g., *údañc-* ‘directed upward’), and in 2 of its 6 occurrences (IV.6.9, VII.56.16) the context favors the sense ‘well-directed’ (VI.58.4 is unclear). But here, as well as in similar adjectival sequences in VII.10.3 and in IX.73.7, it appears with words referring to seeing or appearance, and I suggest that this usage preserves a semantic relic of the ‘eye’ word (**h₃ekʷ*) that, according to most, is one contributor to the blend that produces the hybrid suffix *-añc-* (see, e.g., AiG III.230). I therefore render it in these contexts as ‘of lovely outlook’ (contra Ge’s ‘schön von ... Bewegung’). Re’s ‘de belle allure’ avoids the directional sense and may reflect an analysis similar to mine, but he does not comment. A zero-grade of the ‘eye’ word is also buried in *prātīka-*, also found in our sequence (*suprātīka-*), and in *ānīka*, which contributes *svanīka-* in 16a (for both see EWA s.vv.).

Although pāda-final *vidvān* is generally used absolutely, here it must take an object, *vayúnāni*.

The clear *s*-aor. subj. *yakṣat* in c invites a subjunctive reading of *vocat* in the next pāda, though it is of course injunctive. Nonetheless, modal readings are quite common for this stem.

VI.15.11: This vs. is unusually conjunction-heavy, with *utá* in pāda a (conjoining clauses) and in d (conjoining nouns), and *vā* 3x in c. In fact there at first appear to be more *vā*’s than there are constituents to conjoin: *yajñásya vā níśitim vā-úditim vā*. However, Klein (DGRV II.195) plausibly explains the first *vā* as sentential (I would prefer the term ‘clausal’ in this case), connecting pāda b with its relative clause *yáḥ ... ānaṭ ...* with its continuation in pāda c. The other two *vā*’s are subclausal, conjoining the two *-ti*-stem action noun phrases, *níśitim vā-úditim vā*, both of which govern the gen. *yajñásya*, the constituency being interrupted by the clausal *vā* in Wackernagel’s position.

In c I assume that the verb is a gapped repetition of *ānaṭ*. Klein tr. the skeleton of bc as “who has attained ... or (has brought about) ...,” so I assume he thinks c has a different underlying verb from b. But the full VP *níśitim ... ānaṭ* in nearby VI.13.4, as well as VI.2.5 *níśitim ... naśat* also in this Agni cycle, establish this as a ritual idiom.

Note the complementary preverbs *ní* ‘down’ and *úd* ‘up’ in the conjoined *níśitim ... úditim*. The latter word is not otherwise used as a ritual term; in all its other occurrences it is a loc. and refers to the rising of the sun. Here it seems to refer to the outcome or the progress of the sacrifice, though it could be more narrowly used for the “rising up” of the fire when it is kindled. This is probably the better interpr. because in 2 of the 4 occurrences of *níśiti-*, VI.2.5 and VIII.19.14, it is implicitly use of the fire.

VI.15.12: The problematic pāda here is c. The initial *sām* in both c and d and the fact that d otherwise contains only a phrase in the nominative invite us to assume that c and d have the same structure and that we should supply the verb *abhy ètu* from c for d, as well as, quite possibly, *tvā*. But though the NP in d, “thousandfold desirable wealth,” is something we would quite naturally invite to “come to you entirely,” the general assumption is that *dhvasmanvāt*, whether it modifies *pāthah* ‘fold’ (Gr, Re) or not (Old, Ge), refers to something undesirable -- e.g., Old’s (ZDMG 55.313) tentative “was voll von Zerfall [decay] ist.” It is therefore uncomfortable to invite it to come anywhere near Agni or us. Certainly both occurrences of its base *dhvasmán-* (IV.6.6, VIII.66.15) are in fact in negative contexts. But the substance itself, smoke, is semantically neutral, and in this ritual context something ‘possessing smoke’ can be positive: the oblation as it is poured into the fire will be surrounded by smoke, and, by one model of the sacrifice, it will go to the gods in Agni’s smoke as that smoke rises to heaven. I therefore supply *havyám* here (found in this *tr̥ca* in 10d), and take *tvā* and *pāthah* as two sequential accusatives of goal. Agni is the first destination of the smoke-wrapped oblation, which must be poured into the fire, but it then goes to “the fold (of the gods)” for their consumption -- *devānām* is a standard dependent gen. with *pāthah* (esp. in *Āprī* hymns, II.3.9, III.8.9, etc.).

VI.15.13: Pāda b is nicely configured: *viśvā veda jānimā jātāvedāḥ*. The first two and the last two words alliterate. The final word, the epithet *jātāvedas-*, is immediately preceded by two independent words etymologically related to its two members (in reverse order): *veda* to *-vedāḥ*, *jānimā* to *jātā-*. (Of course, *-vedas-* may ultimately derive from $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘find, possess’, but at least folk-etymologically it belongs with $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘know’.) And *viśvā veda* evokes the cmpd *viśvá-vedas-*, a parallel formation to *jātā-vedas-*. Nothing profound here, but a pleasing way to deploy four words.

VI.15.14: The first pāda is a 13-syllable Triṣṭubh; as Old notes (ZDMG 55.313 and Noten), it would be possible to delete init. *agne* without affecting sense, but on the other hand it is difficult to see why it would have been secondarily appended.

In pāda a it is unclear how to construe *viśāḥ*. Note first that by accent it must be abl./gen. sg., not acc. pl. (*viśāḥ*). Ge (see n. 14ab) takes it as a second gen. with following voc. *hotāḥ*, but in that case we would expect *viśāḥ* to lose its accent in the voc. phrase (as *adhvaryasya* has), and, further, *viśó hótā-* is not a standard title, as far as I can find. It might be possible to supply **pāti-* “(lord) of the clan,” matching *grhāpatiḥ* in the previous vs. (13a), next to *hótā*; cf. *viśpātiḥ* in 8d. However, I think the most likely solution is similar to the one also proposed for 1c -- to supply *havyám* as the object of *vēḥ* in b (see *havyā* in d), with *viśāḥ* dependent on *havyám*. Recall that the poet’s name is Vītihavya, and he seems to like concealed puns on his name. As a support for their connection, note that the two phonologically similar words *viśāḥ* and *vēḥ* take the same position in their respective pādas. Re’s solution is somewhat similar to mine, with *viśāḥ* dependent on an object supplied for *vēḥ*, but his proposed object is “la fonction du messenger” and he makes *adhvarasya* a parallel gen. to *viśāḥ* ignoring its lack of accent. His supplied obj. *dūtyāni* is certainly

conceivable: he adduces IV.7.8 *vér adhvarásya dūtyāni* ... But to my mind the pun on the name of the poet weighs more heavily.

In pāda b there is close sandhi in the sequence *vés t(u)vám*; the reason for this is unclear, esp. since by all standard interpr. (incl. mine) *t(u)vám* belongs to a new clause -- the parenthetical one marked by *hí* -- and so there is a particularly sharp syntactic boundary between them.

In c *mahinā* fits semantically much better in the subordinate *yád* clause than in the main clause (and is so taken by the standard interpr.), but it seems to be positioned too far to the left, with another element interposed before the subordinator: ... *mahinā ví yád bhūh*. I attribute this word order disturbance to the same factor that caused trouble in 1c: like *janúṣā*, *mahinā* only occurs immediately after the caesura in trimeter vs. Given this constraint, the only possible adjustment to produce the expected sequence would be an ordering *mahinā *yád ví*, which would put the subordinator in the correct 2nd position of its clause but produce a bad Triṣṭubh cadence (– – ~ ×). A somewhat similar situation is found in II.1.15c *prkṣó yád átra mahinā ví te bhúvat*, where *mahinā* causes some distortion in word order, though the placement of the subordinator is not affected.

With Lüders (438) I take *ṛtā* as neut. acc. pl. and supply ‘hymns’ (Lieder), rather than taking it as an instr. sg.; this interpr. is supported by VII.39.1 *ṛtām ... yajāti*, with the neut. sg. acc.

Note the phonetic interplay of *v*, *h*, and *y* in d *havyā vaha yaviṣṭha yā* ...

VI.15.15: As Old points out (see publ. intro.), this is no doubt the last vs. of this collection of ṛcas, with vss. 16–19 later additions. There is some faint sign of ring composition with the first ṛca: *súdhītāni* in pāda a reprises *súdhitam* in 2a, as *dadhīta* with Agni as object does *dadhūh* also in 2a. The last three pādas of this vs., esp. de, appear to be a refrain: pāda e is identical to VI.2.11e = 14.6e in this Agni cycle, and pāda d *ágne víśvāni dūrītā tarema* is a variant of VI.2.11d = 14.6d *dviṣó áṃhāṃsi dūrītā tarema*, hence my supplied “narrow straits” here. These refrain pādas also signal that the hymn (or the ṛcas loosely collected into a hymn) once ended here.

On the anomalous position of *hí* here, see comm. ad III.31.12, where the idiosyncratic behavior of $\sqrt{khyā}$ is discussed. Here the immediate preverbal position of *hí* is esp. anomalous because the preverb *abhí* has been fronted (as opposed to III.31.12 ... *ví hí kyán* #, where the preverb stays in the verb complex).

VI.15.16: The phrase “wooly womb” (*ūrṇāvantam yónim*) is striking as a designation of Agni’s seat. Ge (n. 16b) thinks it refers to the barhis, but in fact the fire is not placed on that dry grass, which might produce a conflagration disruptive to the ritual. I think it must rather refer to twigs and foliage still present on the firewood.

In agreement with Ge (who is hesitant -- see n. 16c) and Re, I see a verse-internal enjambment: the two accusatives directly after the hemistich boundary, *kulāyīnam ghṛtāvantam*, qualify *yónim*, which ends pāda b; then there is a syntactic break in the middle of the pāda, with dat. *savitré* construed with d, not c. This is unusual, but it is difficult to find a function for *savitré* in the preceding clause.

VI.15.17: Ge and Re take *añkūyánt-* as a positive quality parallel to *ámūra-*; e.g., Re: “(dieu) faiseur de méandres, (dieu) exempt d’égarement.” I think rather that they are opposites and that the vs. concerns the flight of Agni and his recovery by the gods: note the imperfect *ānayan* (Pp. *ā ānayan*, though technically it could be *ā nayan* with an injunctive). Though Agni sought to elude the gods by taking a circuitous course, they found him and brought him straight back from the dark depths of the water. The “dark places” can of course also refer to the night, after which the ritual fire is kindled, but I think the primary reference is mythological.

VI.15.18: On *jāniṣvā* as belonging to the *-iṣ-*aorist, see Narten (Sig.-Aor, 68).

VI.15.19: The slangy *asthūrī* ‘not one-horse’ is appropriate to this later addition to the hymn. Its positive *sthūrī* ‘one-horse’ is found in the RV only once in the late X.131.3.

VI.16 Agni

VI.16.1: The tr. “for the human race” reads like a dative, but *mānuṣe jāne* is of course a locative. Unfortunately English lacks the “bei” / “chez” locution that would idiomatically tr. this loc.

VI.16.2–3: The first pādas of these vss. end respectively in *adhvaré#* and *ádhvanaḥ#*, which seems to signal an awareness of the deeper etym. relationship between the two stems.

VI.16.3: Klein (DGRV II.122) tr. b *pathás ca devāñjasā* as “and the paths going straight unto the heavenly ones,” apparently reading *devāñjasā* as a compd., contrary to the Pp. and all standard tr. (incl. mine), which separate *deva* as a voc. Although I think the voc. interpretation is correct, cf. X.73.7 *pathó devatrāñjaseva yānān* “... the paths as if going straight to the gods,” with the adv. *devatrā* immed. preceding and construed with *āñjasā*. On the basis of X.73.7 and similar phraseology, Insler (KZ 82 [1968] “Vedic *āñjasā*, *ñjasānā-*, and the Type *sahasānā-*,” p. 6) takes *devāñjasā* as a shortening of *devatrāñjasā* or “a type of haplological abbreviation of *devayānān āñjasā*” or possibly even directly as an “adverbial-type compound” *devāñjāsā*, and Klein must be flg. the Insler interpr. one way or the other. Although X.73.7 is suggestive, I do not think it is sufficient to allow the rather extreme type of haplogy posited by Insler.

VI.16.4–6: As noted in the publ. intro., each vs. in this trca begins with a form of the 2nd sg. prn., although all three are slightly different: the acc. sg. *t(u)vām* in 4a shows distraction; both 5a and 6a contain the nom. sg., but the 1st is undistracted, the 2nd distracted.

VI.16.4: Klein (DGRV II.122) ascribes “logical conjunctive value ‘therefore’” to *ádha* here, connecting vss. 3 and 4. But since vs. 4 begins a new *ṛca*, it seems unlikely that vs. 4 is being conjoined to the *ṛca*-final vs. 3. Moreover, *ádha* here is displaced from its usual *pāda*-initial position to immediately precede *dvitā*, as it does several times elsewhere (I.132.3, VIII.1.28, 84.2, all *pāda*-final as here; also *pāda*-initial VIII.13.24 = IX.102.1, VIII.83.8). On the preceding page (DGRV II.121) Klein calls *ádha dvitā* a collocation and gives it “quasi-formulaic status.” The occurrence here must belong to this group.

In b *bharatō vājibhiḥ* “Bharata with his prize-winner” is an untranslatable pun on the poet’s name Bharad-vāja, whose name appears in the next vs. (5c).

The ritualistic verbs *īle* ‘reverently invoke’ (a) and *ījé* ‘sacrifice’ (c) are exact rhymes (save for accent). I take them here as 3rd sg., as do Ge and Re. Although the 3rd sg. to the former stem is usually *ītte* with *īle* the 1st sg., in this context a 3rd sg. reading is favored, and the lack of accent on *īle* allows it to be drawn into the morphological orbit of the pf. *ījé* (cf. 3rd sg. perfect-accented *īḍé* in IV.3.3). Kü (389), flg. Tichy, takes both verbs as 1st sg., which is equally possible, as long as Bharata is referring to himself by name: “You do I, Bharata, reverently invoke ...”

VI.16.5: A verb must be supplied in this vs., with ‘give’ being the obvious choice.

VI.16.6: The “divine race” (*daívyam jánam*) here may resonate with the “human race, race stemming from Manu” (*mānuṣe jáne*) in 1c, though they belong to different *ṛcas*.

VI.16.7–9: This *ṛca* likewise has a form of the 2nd sg. prn. beginning each vs. (7 *t(u)vām*, 8 *táva*, 9 *t(u)vám*), again all different.

VI.16.8: (*prá*) *yakṣi* is morphologically ambiguous -- 2nd sg. act. -*si* impv. or 1st sg. middle *s*-aor. -- and opinion is divided: Old (ZDMG 55.314, Noten) dithers and doesn’t ultimately decide; Ge, Narten (Sig.Aor. 200–201), and Klein (DGRV I.385) opt for the 1st sg., Re for the 2nd but to the root $\sqrt{yakṣ}$. A strong factor in favor of a 2nd sg. to \sqrt{yaj} is the presence of an undoubted form of this same -*si* impv. in the following vs. (9c; cf. also 2c); in favor of a non-2nd-sg. interpr. is the difficulty of construing *pāda*-initial *táva* with such an impv. I consider the form the 2nd sg. act. to \sqrt{yaj} , on the basis not only of 9c but also vs. 13 in the previous hymn (VI.15), where Agni is the subj. of a (pres.) impv. to *prá* \sqrt{yaj} : VI.15.13d *yájiṣṭhaḥ sá prá yajatām ṛtāvā* “let him, the best sacrificer, the truthful one, set the sacrifice in motion.” What then to do with the rest of the first two *pādas*? I accept Ludwig’s suggestion (registered by Old) that *prá yakṣi* is a parenthesis -- or rather, I think that, because of the rigid parallel patterning in this *ṛca*, *táva*, which belongs with the clause beginning *saṁdṛśam*, has been fronted around the peremptory impv. *prá yakṣi*, and that it is dependent on the NP *saṁdṛśam utá krátum*: “your manifestation and resolve do they take pleasure in.” This is, strictly speaking, ungrammatical, but rhetoric occasionally trumps syntax.

VI.16.10: Both Ge and Re supply ‘gods’ as the underlying object of *vītáye*, and this is supported by *devávītaye* in vs. 7 (and 41). But as in the previous hymn (VI.15.1, 14), I think the default object of $\sqrt{v}i$ here is *havyá-*, suggested by the name Vīta-havya, the poet to whom VI.15 is ascribed. Here the *havyá-* can easily be extracted from the parallel purpose dative *havyá-dātaye* in b and its absence explained as gapping. However, the Ge/Re solution is certainly possible, and there are no major implications either way.

VI.16.13–15: Another *ṛca* with fronted ‘you’ beginning all three vss., though here the 2nd two occurrences actually involve the enclitic with preposed pronominal prop: 14–15 *tám u tvā*, as opposed to 13 *tvām*. This *ṛca* is also characterized by snippets of mythology, contrasting with the otherwise monotonous focus on the standard ritual tropes. Unfortunately the snippets are just that -- they remain undeveloped.

This *ṛca* is recited in śrauta ritual during the churning of the fire; see Krick (Feuergründung, 297)

VI.16.13: On the ritual use of the lotus and the relevance of this vs., see Krick (Feuergründung, 155–59), where (155) she calls this vs. “die Primärquelle für die Verwendung eines Lotusblattes im Feuerritual.”

In *c vāghátah* can be gen. sg. or nom. pl. (as I take it, with Ge and Re). Since I don’t know what’s going on here, I would certainly not exclude the gen. sg.: “... (churned) from the head of every *vāghát*” (so Krick 297) It is perhaps relevant that *vísvasya vāghátah* phonologically echoes *vísvasya jágataḥ* “of the whole world” (I.101.5, IV.13.3, VI.50.7, VII.60.2, 101.2, X.73.8).

VI.16.16: The stem *ítara-* is very rare in the RV and has a late distribution: besides this passage it is found only in the funeral hymns X.16.9–10 and X.18.1. This comparative isolation makes it difficult to determine its nuance here. Both Ge and Re (cf. also Klein DGRV I.266, Oberlies RdR I.242) think the phrase “other hymns” (*ítarā gírah*) refers to the hymns of a rival sacrificer (or sacrificers), and certainly the *-tara-* suffix implies a choice of two, which has the further potential implication that one of them is bad. But, though the publ. tr. rather vaguely reflects this interpr., I now think it is likely wrong. Instead, I think that the implicit contrast is between *itthā* ‘in just this way’ and *ítara-*, and I further think that *ítarā gírah* is the acc. obj. of *brávāṇi*, not the nom. subj. of a nominal clause in embedded direct speech. By this interpr. the speaker is telling Agni that in addition to the hymn or hymns he [=Agni] has already heard, the speaker will tell him other hymns *in the same manner* as the previous ones. In other words, he is promising a continuation of the recitation that has already pleased Agni, as well as promising to strengthen him with a physical offering — the usual pairing of verbal and physical in the sacrifice. This interpr. follows that of Hertha Krick (Feuergründung, p. 571): “Komm herbei, Agni, schön will ich dir auf solche Weise noch andere Lobpreisungen sagen! Durch diese Tropfen sollst du wachsen.” I would now emend the tr. to “Come here. I will speak other

hymns to you, Agni, in this same way, and with these drops here you will become strong.”

Oberlies claims that this is one of the only places in the RV that soma is pressed for Agni, but I do not see why the drops (*indu-*) can't be drops of ghee. To be sure, *indu-* overwhelmingly refers to soma drops, but I don't think that soma *has* to be the referent.

VI.16.17: Note the phonological resonance between 16b *itarāḥ* and 17b *úttaram*.

The temptation is very strong to take *dadhase*, despite its lack of accent, as the verb of the subord. cl. introduced by *yátra kvà ca* in pāda a, whose correlate *tátra* begins the last pāda (c). And indeed almost all interpr. (Old, Ge, Re, Klein DGRV I.266) have succumbed to this temptation. Old (ZDMG 55. 314–15) constructs an elaborate justification for the interpr., which he maintains in the *Noten* (though without the extensive special pleading). But despite Old's claim (*Noten*) that “*dadhase* kann nicht ohne Gezwungenheit als Hauptsatzverb aufgefasst werden,” I see no problem. I agree that a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ should be supplied in the *yátra* clause -- perhaps *hitám*, as in I.187.6 *tvé ... máno hitám*. The main clause of b, with its short-vowel subjunctive *dadhase*, expresses the next step in the process: after he has set his mind on something, he then will apply his skill to it -- the progression from mental conception to physical realization that we frequently encounter in the RV. I take *úttara-* here not as a qualification of value, ‘higher’ (e.g., Klein's “higher skill”), but as a temporal or logical ‘next, later’ expressing the progress from a to b. The *tátra* clause of c gives us a third step, but the fact that this adverb correlates with *yátra* does not mean that the intermediate clause has to be under the domain of *yátra*.

VII.16.18: It is not clear whether *te pūrtám* refers to a gift given *to* Agni or *by* him. The publ. tr. takes it in the former sense, assuming that our gift to Agni will trigger his own actions for us in pāda c, in the standard reciprocal model of Vedic sacrifice. Scar (293), in keeping with his interpr. of *nemānām* (see below), also thinks it's a gift to Agni, but from others (“was [dir von anderen] geschenkt wird”). Re (see esp. his n. expanding his tr.) takes it as Agni's gift to us, and I interpr. Ge's “deine Schenkung” in the same fashion. In fact, either interpr. is possible, and the choice will be influenced by one's interpr. of pāda c.

The stem *néma-*, cognate to Aves. *naēma-* ‘half’, is implicitly oppositional, picking out one moiety or side, or simply “some” out of a larger group. Here the unaccented gen. pl. *nemānām*, part of the voc. phrase headed by *vaso*, refers, in my view, to *our* side. This is clearly Ge's view because he footnotes his slightly awk. “du Gott der einen Partei” with “Der Fromme oder Arier.” Other renderings are so awkward as to be almost unintelligible: Re “o Vasu, (dieu) de quelques-uns,” Klein (DGRV II.71) “o Vasu of some (races).” And Scar (293) takes it as referring to the opposition (“o du Vasu der andere”), which then requires Agni to do some amends-making in pāda c. I consider it extremely unlikely that the poet would address Agni, the focus of his praise, as a god of just *some* people, diluting his power and denying

his omnipresence -- much less as a god of others. I might, however, slightly modify the publ. tr. from “on (our) side” to “of (our) side.”

At first glance pāda c, *átho dúvo vanavase*, with its middle voice seems to involve Agni’s winning *dúvas-* for himself. This would be compatible with the Ge/Re interpr. of pāda a: if Agni gives us a not insignificant gift in pāda a, he has a good chance of wining our *dúvas-* in c. However, the almost identical expression in the immediately preceding hymn, VI.15.6d *devó devēṣu vānate hí no dúvaḥ* “for the god will win friendship for us among the gods,” with the crucial loc. *devēṣu* and dat. of benefit *naḥ*, suggests that Agni is winning something on our behalf. Cf. also, in this hymn, VI.16.28 *agnír no vanate rayím* “Agni will win us wealth.”

The root \sqrt{van} ‘win’ is strongly represented in this hymn, esp. in the middle section. Here we have *vanavase*; elsewhere *vanvánn ávātaḥ* 20, *vanván* 26, *vanvántaḥ* 27, *vanate* 28, as well as *vivāsasi* 12. This repetition cuts across *ṛca* boundaries.

VI.16.19: The “passive” aorist *agāmi* is a hapax and, in this context, a scrambling of adjacent *āgní(r)*.

VI.16.20: The root $\sqrt{dās}$ ‘piously serve’ almost never takes an acc. object of the service or offering (but see vs. 31 below); moreover, it almost exclusively has a mortal subject and a god as recipient of the piety. Here, however, we have the opposite situation: it is impossible to avoid taking Agni as subject and a very concrete *rayím* as acc. object, with the implied recipients being us mortals. The clue here may be the preverb, as *áti* $\sqrt{dās}$ in its other occurrence seems to mean something like ‘out-pious the pious’: *maghaír maghóno áti śūra dāsasi* “With your bounties you outdo the bounteous ones in piety, o champion [=Indra].” Although the case frame is not exactly the same, the nuance is similar: human patrons are bounteous, but Indra is super-bounteous. In our passage Agni provides wealth “beyond all earthly (goods).” I previously thought that “earthly goods” were simply those material things that have their origins on/in the earth rather than heaven, but it may well be more pointed than that here: “goods that are given by those who stem from/dwell on earth, that is, humans.” So Agni outdoes human givers by providing wealth in excess of all the goods they can supply. On ‘goods’ as the appropriate noun to supply with *víśvā* ... *pārthivā*, cf. VI.45.20ab *sá hí víśvāni pārthivām̐, éko vásūni pátyate* as well as VI.59.9, IX.100.3, X.111.10.

VI.16.22: Pāda a contains a 2nd plural enclitic prn. and a plural voc. (*vaḥ sakhāyaḥ* “to/of you, o comrades”), while c has two 2nd singular imperatives (*árca gāya*). The discrepancy in number must reflect the common situation of a poet’s mixing address limited to himself with address to his colleagues and fellow ritual participants. So Ge (n. 22), and see my 2009 “Poetic Self-Reference in the *Rig Veda* and the Persona of Zarathustra,” BAI 19 (Fs. Skjaervø). Ge suggests without much enthusiasm that *árca gāya* could be shortened 1st sg. subjunctives (**árcā *gāyā*), evidently responding to Caland/Henry’s reading the verbs thus in their 1906 *L’Agniṣṭoma*, p. 428 (see Old,

who likewise rejects it). It's worth noting that VI.45.4 has the same configuration but with 2nd plural imperatives: *sákhāyaḥ ... árcata prá ca gāyata* "o comrades, chant and sing forth ..." This parallel is adduced by B1 (RR) ad V.52.4, where he calls our verse "a scrappy stanza ...modelled after existing patterns" (that is, VI.45.4). The parallel is certain apposite, but I doubt that our number discrepancy is simply the result of our poet jumbling together scraps drawn from different sources.

VI.16.23: The injunc. *sīdat*, in conjunction with the acc. of extent of time *mānuṣā yugā* "through the human lifetimes," seems almost to have shed the literal sense of the root \sqrt{sad} 'sit' in favor of expressing pure durativity ("who, through the human lifetimes, *has (always) been ...*") -- though the immediately following *hótā* evokes the standard phrase for the installation of Agni as Hotar, with the full 'sit' clearly present if metaphorically meant. as in VI.1.2 *ádihā hótā ny āsīdaḥ ...* ("then you sat down as Hotar") in this Agni cycle. I rather imagine both senses are meant.

VI.16.25: Given the proximity of *ūrj-* '(solid) nourishment' beginning c, *iṣayaté* in b might better be rendered in a manner closer to *iṣ-* 'refreshment' in the same semantic domain. So Ge "für die speisewünschenden Sterblichen," Re "pour le mortel cherchant la jouissance." I might suggest an alternative "... for the mortal seeking refreshment, / o child of nourishment." What gives me pause, however, is *iṣáyantaḥ* in vs. 27 in the same *tr*ca, where the 'prosper' sense is favored. Although our *dat.* part. has accent on the ending, whereas *iṣáyantaḥ* has (secondary) "causative" accent, in fact oblique forms of *-áya-*participles seem regularly to have desinential accent: cf. *mahayaté* (VII.32.9) to *maháyati*, *kṛpayatāḥ* (VIII.46.16) to *kṛpáyati*. See disc. in my 1983 *-áya-*book, p. 49 with n. 3. Therefore these two nearby forms are likely to belong to the same stem and invite the same *tr*.

VI.16.26: The *krātu-* is presumably Agni's; cf. vs. 23 *kavíkratuḥ* used of him. Ge *tr.* *krátvā* as "Mit dem Gedanken," and takes the interior *pādas* bc as the directly quoted content of that thought. In addition to the aberrant *tr.* of *krātu-* (though one could *tr.* "with the intention"), this seems unnecessary. Although, as Ge notes, *krátvā* in IV.1.1 does introduce such direct speech, it is marked there by *íti*, and the circumstances there are different as well.

VI.16.29: This vs. ushers in a set of forms of $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ (also vss. 36, 40, 41, 47, 48).

VI.16.30: Note the close sandhi effect in the voc. phrase *brahmaṇas kave*. As Ge points out, this *pāda* is a variant of I.18.3 *rákṣā ṇo brahmaṇas pate*, with the more usual head noun *pāti-*.

VI.16.31: I do not know what the *ā* ending the first *pāda* is doing. Sāy. takes it as preverb with *dāśati*, but this root doesn't otherwise appear with *ā*, and *pāda*-final position is a strange place to put a preverb. There's a *pāda*-final *ā* also in 35a, but it is easier to justify, as governing a locational acc.

I am disturbed by the usage of *dāśati* here; for another problematic form to this root, see disc. ad vs. 20 above. The example here describes not pious service but a hostile act exactly contrary to the standard usages of the root. It also deviates from the usual case frame (offer service to a god [DAT] with an offering vel sim. [INSTR]), though a few passages match ours by expressing the offering in the ACC, e.g. I.93.3 ... *yá āhutiṃ, yó vāṃ dāśād dhaviṣkr̥tim* “whoever will piously perform a poured offering or the preparation of an oblation for you.” Assuming the reading is correct, I think we must see this as a monstrous reversal: instead of piously offering an oblation (ACC) to a god (DAT), the evil mortal is impiously offering *us* (ACC), as a sort of oblation, to a weapon of death (DAT). The standard tr. (including mine) elide the shock of the use of this verb of ritual service in such a context, by tr. $\sqrt{dāś}$ differently from usual. But I’m not sure how to remedy this in tr. without a lot of explanatory baggage. Perhaps “who will ‘piously’ offer us ...”?

Ge and Re take *tāsmāt ... āmhasaḥ* as a single NP “from that *āmhas-*,” but this requires taking *yāḥ* in pāda a as an improper rel. for “when” (so Ge) or seeing the relation between ab and c as an anacoluthon (so Re), because their interpr. of c provides no referent for *yāḥ ... mārtaḥ* in the dependent cl. This can all be fixed by separating the two abl. in the main clause, with *tāsmāt* the correlative to *yāḥ*. Since the immediately preceding vs. (30) has exactly the structure envisioned for our c pāda -- two parallel ablatives, one *āmhasaḥ* and the other referring to a person -- there is very local precedent.

VI.16.35: This vs. is syntactically incomplete (unless we take *sīdan* in c as a predicated pres. part., which seems unlikely, since this is a repeated pāda [=IX.32.4, IX.64.11]), but it works well as adjunct to the previous vs., 34.

Pāda a shows the preoccupation with kinship that is characteristic of Agni material. The paradox “father of his father” (*pitúṣ pitā* [note close sandhi effect]) probably reflects two themes -- 1) that the priest who kindles the fire is in some sense his/its father, but Agni the god has a fatherly relationship to his mortal worshippers, 2) that the offering fire (later called the *Āhavanīya*) is “taken out” of what is later called the *Gārhapatya* and is therefore in some sense its son, but the offering fire is more important than the other fires on the ritual ground and can therefore be considered their father.

The meaning ‘syllable’ for *akṣāra-* is quite stable in later Skt., but in the RV it sometimes has its literal sense ‘imperishable’. Nonetheless in our passage I think ‘syllable’ is meant: the ritual fire is kindled when the hymn (here represented by the syllable) is recited. So, more or less, Ge “bei der (heiligen) Rede (?) aufleuchtend” (sim. Kü 250), though cf. Re “dans (l'espace) inépuissable.”

The pāda-final *ā* in c was mentioned above ad vs. 31, where it was pointed out that the occurrence here in 35c can easily be accounted for. *ā* frequently governs a preceding acc. (see collection in Gr., col. 169), and in fact *yónim ā* is found not only in this pāda and its repetitions (see above), but also in similar pādas in IX.61.21, 65.19).

VI.16.39: Unlike most *-hán-* cmpds, whose 1st member is the target of the smiting, in *śarya-hán-* the 1st member *śarya-* ‘arrow’ must be in an instr. relationship with the 2nd (see Scar 693), like *muṣṭi-hán* ‘smiting with the fist(s)’. Because “like a powerful shooter with arrows / one who shoots arrows” is exceptionally awkward in English, I’ve substituted ‘sharpshooter’, though it interferes with the *tigmá-* in *tigmá-śṛṅga-* ‘sharp-horned’ in the next pāda.

VI.39.40: The simile marker *ná* is wrongly placed in pāda b, for no obvious reason.

The two comparanda to Agni -- a bangle in the hand, a newborn babe, both carried -- suggest that this is the newly kindled fire and/or possibly the offering fire being taken out of the householder’s fire and carried to the east.

VI.16.41: This impression about vs. 40 is supported by vs. 41.

VI.16.42: However, the waters are somewhat muddled by vs. 42. The loc. *jātávedasi* (the only such form in the RV) is puzzling, since *jātávedas-* is one of the standard epithets of Agni and the accusatives in the vs. clearly refer to Agni as well. Thus we must be dealing with two fires. This idea would be perfectly compatible with the scenario I suggested for vs. 40 -- *except* that acc. *gṛhapátim* in pāda c suggests that the newly born fire being “whetted” is not the offering fire (later to be called the *Āhavanīya*) taken out of the old fire and moved to its new location, but rather what will come to be called the *Gārhapatya*. The (later) ritual complex that this most resembles is the creation of the *Mahāvedi* (see my Hyenas, p. 89, inter alia), in which the old *Āhavanīya* of the standard ritual ground is moved further to the east during the creation of the *Mahāvedi*, and the old *Āhavanīya* becomes the *Gārhapatya*. Thus it seems that vss. 40–41 concern the further displacement of the *Āhavanīya* fire and 42 depicts the resettlement of the original householder’s fire onto the place the *Āhavanīya* occupied in the more restricted ritual ground. This may be Ge’s view; see his n. 41ab, where he refers to the *agnipraṇayana*, which involves carrying the *Āhavanīya* to the *Uttaravedi* in the animal sacrifice (see Sen, Dict. of Vedic Rituals, s.v.; Caland-Henry, *Agniṣṭoma* pp. 78–79). However, his n. 42 goes in a different direction. If this really does concern the creation of the *Mahāvedi* from the ordinary ritual ground, we would have evidence for this degree of elaboration already in (late) Rigvedic ritual.

VI.16.43: The *hí* in the impv. clause is somewhat disturbing, since there is no following impv. in this vs. to which the *hí* impv. clause could serve as basis. However, 44a contains two impvs. that logically follow the *yukṣvā* ‘yoke!’ -- namely *yāhi ā vaha* “drive and convey here!”

VI.16.44: The very compressed pāda b could be elucidated with “... for (them=gods) to pursue (them=offerings).” There are numerous parallels that establish this as the intention.

VI.16.47: Bloomfield (ad V.6.5) proposes tr. our passage “We bring ... oblation with song fashioned in the mind,” suggesting that “the cases of ṛcā and havīḥ are inverted.” This is certainly true at the level of deep-structure formula: *hṛdā taṣṭá-* “fashioned by the heart” normally modifies a verbal product, e.g. I.171.2 *stómo hṛdā taṣṭáh*. But, as so often, the poet is playing with our expectations by producing a twist on the standard phraseology.

VI.16.47–48: This long hymn (or the short final ṛca) seems to end with a buried poetic signature: 47b ends with *bharāmasi*, 48c with *vājīnā*, the last word of the hymn. Together they are the elements that make up the poet’s name Bharadvāja.