VI.17 Indra
> This hymn is marked by clusters of localized repetitions and echoes; see disc. below.

VI.17.1–3: These first three vss. form something of a unity. Each begins with a "drink!" imperative (1a *píbā sómam*, 2a *sá īm pāhi*, 3a *evā́ pāhi*), and each contains the lexeme *abhí* √*tṛd* 'drill through to'. As outlined below, it is a pleasingly designed rhetorical structure, whose balance and contrast only become evident after conscious analysis.

VI.17.1: Ge (fld. by Schmidt, B+I, 144) takes *yám* as obj. of *abhí* and referring to *sómam* in the opening impv. phrase ("Drink the soma, towards which …"). As Old points out (both ZDMG 55.319–20 and Noten), this entails either that the soma is within the cow enclosure or at least that breaking into the cow enclosure is a necessary auxiliary action for getting or preparing the soma -- which is, of course, not a standard part of the Vala myth. Old therefore emends the text, from *yám* to *yáḥ, producing parallel rel. clauses concerning the Vala myth and the Vṛtra myth respectively, with Indra the subject of both, represented by *yáḥ. But how would this corruption arise? Old suggests that *yáḥ (*yá in this sandhi context) was changed to *yám* because it immediately follows *abhí*, but it is hard to conceive of a Rigvedic poet who could be misled by a separable preverb, esp. since the 2nd hemistich has a supposedly parallel rel. cl. containing *yáḥ*, likewise following a preverb (*ví*). I agree with Old that Ge's interpr. is unlikely, but I do not think this requires changing the text. Instead I think *píbā sómam* is an abrupt hortatory opening, essentially detached from the rest of the vs., and I take the *yám* as referring to the *ūrváṃ gávyam*. This whole clause anticipates the imperatival main clauses that end the next vss., 2d *sá indra citrā́m̐ abhí tṛndhi vā́jān* and 3d … *abhí gā́ indra tṛndhi*, both with *abhí* √*tṛd* and an obj. that refers to the contents of the cattle enclosure. My interpr. requires the rel. cl. of 1ab to float in syntactic suspension till it is resolved in 2d, with a number of other things going on in between -- mostly rel. clauses with Indra as subject, but I do not think this is much to ask of a Rigvedic audience. In fact, I think that the rel. cl. in 1ab is the initial marker of the ring structure that prevails in these three vss.

> In d Ge suggests that *vṛtrám* is a "collective singular" and should be construed with neut. pl. *víśvā amitríyā*, tr. "alle feindseligen Vṛtra's." I see no advantage to ignoring the number, and the passages he adduces as parallel do not impose the notion of "collective singular."

VI.17.2: Again I think the "drink!" imperative is semi-detached from the rest of the vs., a mere interruption of the sequence of rel. clauses with Indra as subj., which begins with a fully realized clause in 1cd and continues in 2abc with a set of five compressed definitional nominal clauses with an izafe-like feel.

VI.17.3: The "drink!" sequence is brought to an end with a summary *evā́* in 3a. The verse continues with a series of 7 choppy imperatival clauses, all but the first (*mándatu tvā*) with Indra as subj., which balance the choppy nominal relative clauses of vs. 2. The last of these clauses is the third iteration of *abhí* √*tṛd*, with which we began.

VI.17.3–5ab: *mándatu tvā* in 3a inaugurates a 3-vs. sequence chained together by the root √*ma(n)d* 'exhilarate', a sequence whose 1st vs. (3) overlaps with the last vs. of the initial triad. The other representatives also occur in the 1st pāda: *mádāḥ* in 4a and *mandasānáḥ* in 5a. Cf. also *matsarāsaḥ* in 4d. The conceptual unity of the sequence is underlined by the fact that 5ab is a rel. clause that must hang off the previous vs. The 2nd hemistich of 5 marks a sharp break.

VI.17.6: This last vs. of the Vala section reprises *ūrváṃ gávyam* from 1b with *ūrvād gāḥ* in 6b, both immediately pre-caesura, producing a ring. Thus, the supposedly problematic rel. cl. of 1ab participates in two rings in this brief 6-vs. section, with different parts of the clause in play in the two rings. See disc. ad vs. 1.

VI.17.7-10: An initial phonological sequence unifies this set of vss.: from the 2nd half of 7 through the 1st half of 10 every hemistich begins with *ádh* (or the variants *ád* and *áh*): 7c *ádhā(rayo)*, 8a *ádha*, 8c *ád(eva)*, 9a *ádha*, 9c *áh(im)*, 10a *ádha*.

VI.17.7: Both Old (ZDMG 55.320 and Noten) and Ge (fld. by Klein DGRV II.92–93) strongly argue that *paprắtha* belongs to √*prath* 'spread', not √*prā* 'fill', to which Gr assigns it. I find their insistence puzzling. On their side, *ví* √*prath* is a fairly common lexeme, used often of the earth, whereas *ví* is rare to non-existent with √*prā*. But the actual verb form is wrong for all sorts of reasons. First, the indic. pf. of √*prath* is otherwise only middle, but this would be act. Second, the root √*prath* never otherwise has vṛddhi forms, but the root syllable here is *prāth*. Then, if it is a 3rd sg. (so Ge "Er breitete …"), it opens a cosmogonic sequence of 2nd sg. expressions, and such formulaic cosmogonies tend to be consistent in ps. and no. (though see 9cd below). Recognizing this last problem, Old suggests it's a 2nd sg., standing for *paprath-tha* > *paprattha*, with the heavy syllable *atth* redistributing metrical weight [not his terminology] to *āth*. This type of change would not be unusual in Middle Indic, but it would have been useful to provide parallel examples in Rig Veda. Moreover, since √*prath* is a seṭ root, we should in any case expect a 2nd sg. *paprathitha*. The only factor on their side of the ledger is the preverb, and since our poet no doubt playfully recognized that the form would evoke √*prath*, it is not surprising that he would import the preverb. Unambiguous perfect forms to √*prā* 'fill' frequently take the earth as obj. as here (e.g., III.30.11 *índra ā paprau pṛthivīm utá dyām*), which makes the Old/Ge intransigence all the more surprising.

In pāda a *máhi dáṃsaḥ* interrupts the obj. phrase *kṣām … urvīm*. Ge's nominal phrase "— ein grosses Meisterstück—" is less disruptive than my nominal clause "great is your wondrous skill," and might be preferable on those grounds.

VI.17.8: As Ge points out, the non-god (*ádeva-*) is presumably Vṛtra. This identification is clinched by the fact that the verb here, *aúhiṣṭa* 'vaunted himself' (√*uh/oh*), reappears in the (pseudo-)participle *óhasāna-* modifying *áhi-* 'serpent' in the next vs. (9c).

In d the pres. *vṛṇate* is a bit surprising in this mythological narrative.

VI.17.9: The word and particle order of the 1ˢᵗ hemistich seems designed to produce despair in those of us who seek (and believe in) principles and rules for such ordering: *ádha dyaúś cit te ápa sā́ nú vájrād, dvitā́namat* … seems randomly to scatter nouns, pronouns, and particles through the first pāda. However, I think that my interpr. of the first pāda imposes more rationality on the sequence than Ge's does and also eliminates at least one further problem. Note first the preverb *ápa* in the middle of the 1ˢᵗ pāda, though preverbs in tmesis (as this is, from *anamat* in b) usually move to metrical boundaries. [It is true that it appears directly after the caesura, but generally a preverb in tmesis takes this position only when the verb is in the same pāda, or such is my impression.] Note, moreover, the apparent doubling of the subject *dyaúḥ* with the pronoun *sā́* likewise in the middle of the same pāda, directly after the preverb. Note finally that after a beginning that seems to conform fairly well to Rigvedic word-order norms (extraclausal introductory *ádha*, noun+emphatic ptcl *dyaúś cid*, enclitic prn. in modified 2ⁿᵈ position *te*), the clause seems to begin over again: preverb *ápa*, prn. *sā́* (curiously, fem. *sā́* seems more inclined to 2ⁿᵈ position than masc. *sá*), modified 2ⁿᵈ pos. ptcl. *nú*. Ge's tr. simply ignores this stuttering start ("Da wich selbst der Himmel von deiner Keule .."), and he also doesn't comment on the fact that his interpr. implicitly requires *dyaúḥ* to be picked up by a fem. prn.: Gr lists this passage as one where that noun has fem. gender. Although 'heaven' sometimes does seem to be fem., such passages are rarer than Gr makes out, and this example would be esp. striking because there's no reason for *dyaúḥ* to be doubled by a pronoun in the first place, whatever its gender.

I think both problems can be solved by assuming that *sā́* actually adds a second referent to the clause; in context with 'heaven' this would obviously be the fem. 'earth' (generally *pṛthivī́-*, but perhaps here, because of their joint presence in 7ab, *kṣā́-*). No Rigvedic audience would need further specification, once the feminine gender of the referent was established. By this interpr. the post-caesura sequence *ápa sā́ nú* … is not an awkward redo of the 1ˢᵗ half of the pāda, but introduces a parallel subject to *dyaúḥ*, more clearly distinguished from 'heaven' than in the usual dual dvandva formulation. The separation of the two subjects is, in my opinion, signalled by *dvitā́* 'yet again' beginning the next pāda; I render it here as "likewise also." The parallels adduced by Ge (IV.17.2, I.80.11, II.12.13, V.32.9) actually support my interpr. because all four of them depict *both* heaven and earth (or in the case of the last, the two world-halves) trembling in fear of Indra.

Flg. Ge ("… dass er für alle Zeit erlag"), I take *śayáthe* here as a quasi-infinitive expressing purpose with *jaghā́na*; in this function it seems directly parallel to *śayáthāya* in the next hymn (VI.18.8), to the same stem. Unfortunately they must then be in different cases, the dative, understandably, in VI.18.8, the loc., less understandably, here. However much I would like to, I cannot find a way to make our *śayáthe* a dative, there being no athematic stem *śayáth-*. We could, of course, interpr. the locative as a real expression of location: "struck down the serpent in his lair," but not only am I reluctant to lose the semantic connection with VI.18.8, but the acc. extent of time *viśvā́yuḥ* 'for a full lifespan' only makes sense with the verbal interpr. of *śayáthe* 'to lie'.

Despite Gr and Lub, a number of *viśvā́yuḥ* forms, which they assign to the stem *viśvā́yu-* and therefore interpr. as nom. sg. masc., must have the 2ⁿᵈ member *ā́yus-* and therefore be nom./acc. sg. neut., often used as an adverbial indication of extent of time as here (so Ge's tr. as well; see above). See AiG II.2.479. I concede that it would be possible to

take the form as a nom. here — "when Indra, having a full lifespan, struck down the serpent …" — with Indra's full lifespan implicitly contrasting with Vṛtra's death, but I find the extent-of-time adverbial more compelling. And in a passage like I.68.5 *viśvā́yur víśve ápāṃsi cakruḥ* "all have performed their tasks lifelong," the plural subject rules out a nom. sg. interpr. for *viśvā́yuḥ*. Although the stem *viśvā́yu-* certainly exists, it has a doublet with final *-s-*, exactly like the simplex pair *ā́yu-/ ā́yus-*.

Assuming the correctness of the above disc. of *viśvā́yuḥ*, Vṛtra's fate, "to lie there for a full lifespan," is somewhat ironic, since he's dead: he will spend his full lifespan dead.

VI.17.10: With Old I assume an underlying *mahé*, contra Pp. *maháḥ*, despite Ge's doubts (n. 10b).

The morphological identity of *vavṛtat* isn't at all clear. Gr calls it a "Conj." aor.; Whitney seems to suggest a subj. to a redupl. pres. Lub identifies it as a "[RED.AOR.inj.(them.)]." A pf. subj. makes the most formal sense, save for the zero-grade root syllable, but a subjunctive would be out of place in this mythological passage. Kü (460) treats our form as a "Sonderfall" and calls it a thematic injunctive, expressing an action prior to that of the verb *sáṃ piṇak* in d. Since, in his view, this same anterior value is expressed by the impf. of the caus. (*ávartayat* in I.85.9), he calls our form an "Oppositionsbildung zum Kausativ," whatever that means, but ultimately gives up on determining its morphological identity. I agree that the form cannot functionally be a subjunctive and am willing to accept that it is a nonce injunctive -- but this is a description, not an explanation. Note the pf. opt. *vavṛtyāt* in 13d, whose redupl. profile *vavṛt-* matches that of this form.

As for what the clause expresses, I assume that Tvaṣṭar is manufacturing the *vájra-* by turning it on a lathe or lathe-like device. (The internet tells me that the lathe dates back to antiquity, with good evidence from ancient Egypt, but it is difficult to know how much to trust this.) Alternatively, but less likely in my view, Tvaṣṭar is displaying it to Indra by turning it here and there to allow its spikes and edges to glint in the light.

The other verb form in this vs., *sáṃ piṇak* in d, also presents difficulties, because, despite being in a relative cl., it is unaccented. I have no explanation for the failure to accent (nor does Old, I'd point out). Of course, one can note the unusual position of the rel. prn. *yéna*, at the end of pāda c as the first word of the subord. clause that otherwise occupies d, with the rel. prn. intervening between the acc. sg. masc. phrase *níkāmam arámanasam* that modifies the *vájram* of the main cl. and the acc. sg. masc. phrase *návantam áhim* that provides the object of the rel. cl. But Rigvedic poets are unlikely to be thrown by this positioning. It is also noteworthy that pāda c as it stands has only 10 syllables; Old suggests that we might read *iéna* to round out the Triṣṭubh, which would be unprecedented in the rel. prn., as far as I know. Pāda c is also unusual in having 5 light syllables in a row: *(níkā)mam arámana(saṃ yéna)*, and indeed, were we to read *i̯éna*, this would rise to 7. Since *arámanasa-* is a hapax and it participates in a metrically disturbed sequence, it may be that the pāda is somehow corrupt. But no way of fixing any of this comes to mind.

On the retroflex *ṇ* in *piṇak*, see Old, ZDMG 55.321.

VI.17.11: For Agni as the subj. of *pácat* and cooker of the buffaloes, see V.29.7–8 adduced by Ge and Old, ZDMG 55.321.

In the 2nd hemistich we have only two expressed subjects, Pūṣan and Viṣṇu, but a plural verb *dhāvan*. The obvious solution, as seen by all, is to assume that other gods participated in this action.

The question is -- what action? The verb is generally assigned to √*dhāv* 'run'. Gr gives a transitive-causative value to this stem in this passage and this passage alone (Gr "jemandem [D.] etwas [A.] zuströmen"); Ge follows this trans. interpr.: "… liessen für ihn den … (Soma)stengel … strömen," and indeed interprets another passage as having this value (IX.54.2). However, since all other acc. with √*dhāv* are goals to an intrans. verb of motion, this contextual adjustment is unacceptable. Gotō (1st Klasse, 183 and n. 325) disputes both of Ge's trans. interpretations and fixes this passage by dividing the two pādas into two clauses. The first has an acc. goal *sárāṃsi* ("…eilen zu den drei [Soma]seen"), which seems reasonable (indeed cf. IX.54.2 *ayáṃ sárāṃsi dhāvati*), but he must supply a verb ('gave') out of thin air to make pāda d to work: "[sie geben] ihm den Vṛtratötenden, berauschenden Somastengel." The problem can be solved by assigning the verb to the other root √*dhāv* 'rinse', part of the standard vocabulary of soma preparation. VIII.2.25 (*ā́ dhāvata … sómaṃ vīrāya*) presents an exactly parallel construction with soma as acc. obj. and the recipient, Indra, in the dat. Moreover, 'rinse' would add a complementary food-preparation term to √*pac* 'cook' in pāda b, with both solid and liquid nourishment thus covered, whereas 'run' is a bit of a non sequitur. The only thing that gives me pause is X.113.2 *tám asya víṣṇur mahimā́nam ójasā, aṃśúṃ dadhanvān* …, where we have Viṣṇu, the *aṃśú,* and an undoubted 'run' (to the separate root √*dhan[v]*). But this late passage does not seem to me sufficient to outweigh the fact that a 'rinse' interpr. here allows the hemistich to be a single syntactic unit and forestalls the need to supply a verb for d out of nowhere.

VI.17.12: In d *apásaḥ* 'busy, industrious' (Ge's fleissig) is, of course, a pun on the 'water' word, whose acc. pl. is *apás*.

VI.17.14: I take the construction √*dhā* ACC [anim.] ACC.ADJ *-mant-/vant-* to mean "provide someone (X) with something (Y)," lit. "establish X as possessing (*-mant-/vant-*) Y." The datives of ab are then further objects to aspire to: once the poets have brilliance, they can use that brilliance, which transforms into poems, in pursuit of more worldly goals, the prize, etc. This interpr. essentially follows Ge's.

VI.18 Indra

VI.18.1: This vs. contains two pairs of positive/negative etymological figures, both consisting of a pres. participle with "active" value (though one of them is morphologically middle) and a negated past part.: *vanvánn ávātaḥ* "vanquishing but unvanquished" and *áṣāḷham … sáhamānam* "conquering but unconquered." It may not be an accident that the root syllables in each pair, though related by standard derivational processes, are quite distinct because of morphophonemic changes: *van / vā* and *sah / ṣāḷh*.

VI.18.2: On unclear *khaja-* see comm. ad VII.20.3.

VI.18.3: The sequence 2ND SG. PRN *ha tyád* (here *ha nú tyád*) is fairly common and appears to be strongly emphatic, hence my tr. "it was just you" (etc.). In several hymns (I.63.4–7, VIII.96.16–18) this construction is found in series.

      I take the fronted *ásti* followed by *svid* to be a strong existential "does it exist?" rather than simply the possessive constr. that Ge sees: "Hast du … diese Manneskrafte …?"

VI.18.4: The fronted *ásti* in the previous vs. is matched by equally emphatic, fronted *sád íd*. Although Ge takes *sát* as the modifier of the *sáhaḥ* that begins the next pāda, I think instead that it answers the question posed in 3cd and therefore implicitly modifies *vīryàm* in 3c. This is then further specified as *sáhaḥ* beginning in b, which then is qualified by the adjectives *ugrám* and *távīyaḥ* in c.

      The last three pādas of the vs. are a veritable riot of etymological figures, with two each in b and c and one in d: b *sáhaḥ sahiṣṭha turatás turásya*, c *ugrám ugrásya tavásas távīyaḥ*, d *áradhrasya radhratúraḥ* … The 2nd member of this last cmpd, -*tur*-, belongs etymologically with the 2nd figure of b, *turatás turásya*, though unfortunately since it's used in a somewhat different sense, this connection cannot easily be conveyed in translation. Similarly, the 2nd figure of c, *tavásas távīyaḥ*, picks up the *tuvi*- of the cmpd in a, *tuvi-jātá-*. So, in addition to the juxtaposed linear figures, there is some interweaving across pāda boundaries.

VI.18.5: As the opening words of pāda b, *itthā́ vádadbhiḥ*, indicate, the previous pāda is the direct speech of the Aṅgirases. In keeping with the two immediately preceding vss., I take *astu* as an existential: "let that partnership (still) exist." The wording is otherwise very like IV.10.8 *śivā́ naḥ sakhyā́ sántu ... devéṣu yuṣmé*. The clear loc. *devéṣu* in that passage anchors the loc. identity of *yuṣmé* both in that passage and this one. The loc. is somewhat odd: generally *sakhyá-* is construed with gen. or instr., as already set forth by Gr s.v. However, cf. VII.22.9 (=X.23.7), which also contains a pl. ps. prn. in -*e*: *asmé te santu sakhyā́ śivā́ni*. In the publ. tr. I take the *asmé* there as a dat.: "Let there be friendly fellowship of you for us." But in light of the two parallel structures with *yuṣmé*, I think it must be a loc., and these three passages, each of which is rendered differently in the publ. tr., should be harmonized. I now think that all three are existential (although the two with *śivá-* could be equational, with a pred. adj.) and that the loc. specifies the locus of the partnership, either in or "bei" the pronominal referent. Though this is functionally equivalent to "with," as in the publ. tr., I would slightly modify the tr. to better reflect the loc.: "Let there (still) be age-old partnership for us among you," though "… with you" would in fact be clearer.

      The placement of *valám* in the middle of the instr. phrase in b, with its governing verb (*hán*) not found till c, is somewhat odd, but see comm. ad vs. 8 below.

      Presumably the Vala cave is "prospering" because it is full of cows.

      The positive active / negative passive figure found twice in vs. 1 is here embodied in the single word, the root-noun cmpd voc. *acyuta-cyut-* 'shaker of the unshakable'.

VI.18.6: The vs. contains 3 coreferential *sá*, at the beg. of a and of c and in the middle of c. I have interpr. the first half of c as belonging with ab, with the loc. *tokásātā tánaye* parallel to loc. *mahatí vṛtratū́rye* in b and the mid-pāda *sá* in c introducing a new cl. Others (Ge, Schaef., Intens. 126) take all of c with d. There is no way to determine and very little riding on it. However, see the comm. on the next vs.

The *hí* in pāda a seems to have little or no causal value; similarly the one in 4a.

Although the overt *ásti* reminds us of the other overt forms of √ *as* in previous vss. (3, 4, 5), which were (at least by my lights) existential, *ásti* here seems to be a straight copula and therefore pleonastic.

In *tokásātā tánaye* we can assume that *tánaye* shows a kind of gapping of the 2nd cmpd member found in *toká-sāti-*, hence a putative **tánaya-sāti-*. Ge's cited parallels, e.g., II.30.5 *tokásya sātaú tánayasya* …, confirm this.

VI.18.7: This vs. continues the overabundance of *sá* from the last vs., esp. in the 2nd hemistich, with initial *sá* and post-caesura *sá* in c and initial *sá* in d, in addition to the one opening the vs. Each of these *sá* is associated with a different instr. phrase or phrases. The one in the first hemistich has the capacious bipartite *majmánā … ámartyena nā̆mnā* embedded in a full clause with the verb *prá sasre*; the two in pāda c occur only with instrumentals (*dyumnéna* in the opening and the conjoined *śávasotá rāyā́* after the caesura); the one in d has only a single instr. (*vīryèṇa*) but is part of a clause again, though with a pred. adj. *sámokaḥ*, not a finite verb. Since the structure of this vs. is like that of vs. 6, the question again arises as to where to attach c (or the two parts of c). Flg. Ge I take all of c with d, construing all the instrumentals with *sámokaḥ* 'at home (with)'. But I now see that, because the structures in c are minimal, it could as well go with ab (or the first half with ab, the second with d). This would produce alternative translations "Through his greatness and his immortal name he extended himself, (and also) through his brilliance and his power and wealth. He is at home with heroism." or even "Through his greatness and his immortal name he extended himself, (and also) through his brilliance; he is at home with power and wealth and with heroism." (This last, with the first part of c leaning backward and the 2nd leaning forward, would mimic my interpr. of vs. 6.) Again I do not see a way to decide the question, but I think it's worth noting how the poet has cleverly constructed pāda c so that it is ambig.

VI.18.8: As Ge points out (n. 8b), the role of Cumuri and Dhuni in the RV is to be put to sleep by Indra, so that Dabhīti can deliver the coup de grâce to them. See the various passages adduced by Ge and esp. nearby VI.26.6. In our vs. they are marooned at the end of the first hemistich, and after an initial verb in c another set of Indra's victims is introduced: Pipru, Śambara, and Śuṣṇa. Ge asks whether we should assume an ellipsis with Cumuri/Dhuni phrase (in other words, supply a form of "put to sleep") or a zeugma (in other words, to take them as objects of *vṛṇák* with the Pipru group, though their fates were met in different ways). I have chosen the 2nd option. The audience would certainly know the particular destiny of Cumuri and Dhuni but would also be able to lump them in with other targets of Indra, all as objects of a generically violent verb. (It may be worth noting that *vṛṇák* here is one of the very few forms of √ *vṛj* that lacks a preverb, though cf. nearby

VI.26.3.) The segregation of Cumuri and Dhuni in pāda b, away from the verb and the other victims, might give us pause, but cf. vs. 5, where the obj. *valám* is found in the interior of pāda b, with the verb beginning c.

In d the datives *cyautnā́ya* and *śayáthāya* have parallel infinitival function. For the latter cf. also *śayáthe* in the preceding hymn (VI.17.9, with disc. ad loc.) with the same apparent meaning but in a different case.

VI.18.9: *udā́vatā* is read *udávatā* by the Pp. and is generally considered the instr. of the pres. act. part. of *úd √av* 'help', with metrical lengthening (so explicitly Lub), a lengthening that is unmotivated. It is also the case that *úd* is not especially common with √*av*, though I concede that the six passages I'm aware of make this an established usage. I also find it surprising that there is no preverb with *tiṣṭha* in the expression in b, *rátham … tiṣṭha* "mount the chariot," since this expression is almost always found with preverb, generally *ā́*, also *ádhi*. I therefore wonder if the initial string in pāda a is actually concealing the preverb(s), in tmesis: *ud-ā́*, followed by the uncompounded pres. part. *ávatā*. This analysis is responsible for my tr. "up and mount …" I realize, however, that a number of objections can be raised. The combination *ud-ā́* doesn't otherwise occur with √*sthā*, but I would point out that both occur with that root individually. Two further potential problems: 1) two preverbs next to each other in tmesis, rather than the usual single one. I confess I do not know of other examples. 2) the accentuation: the accented vowels of *ā́* and *ávatā* would coalesce, resulting in a single udātta -- this is unproblematic -- but the lack of accent on *ud* looms larger. Here I rely on Macdonell's observation (VGS, p. 469) that when *ā́* is immediately preceded by another preverb, *ā́* alone has the accent. In Macdonell's formulation this applies (only) to these sequences when compounded with verbs; I would here extend that to the same sequence in tmesis. This may be too much machinery to deploy simply in order to account for the surprising, supposed metrical lengthening of *udā́vatā* and the surprising lack of preverb with *tiṣṭha*, but it seems worth considering. Alternatively, it could be that *udā́vatā is* a cmpded pres. part., but cmpded not only with *úd*, but also *ā́*. This is the solution of Rivelex (I.541), and it may be the best compromise, though *ā́* is not otherwise found with √*av*, as far as I know. (I have not been able to find the *ā́* +√*av* claimed by Rivelex in the head note on p. 538, and in the claimed *prá ā́* passage (VIII.23.2), *ā́* is a postposition, as is more or less admitted p. 543 n. 1.)

The *ca* in the instr. phrase in pāda a seems pleonastic, and if it is implicitly connecting the two adj. modifying *tvákṣasā*, viz. *ávatā* (or *udā́vatā*) and *pányasā* (Klein DGRV I.71 "aiding and wondrous"), they seem ill-assorted semantically. I wonder if it is meant to connect the first ADJ.-NOUN pair with a 2nd, with gapping of the noun modified by *pányasā* ("with your helpful energy and ever more admirable X"). But there is no standard *pányas-* NOUN formula, so I will not pursue this.

In d Old (Noten) and Ge assume that the *māyā́ḥ* are negative magical wiles that belong to Indra's opponents. A negative valuation of *māyā́-* is of course common, and is clear in the nearby passage VI.22.9, where a pāda almost identical to our c, urging Indra to take his mace in hand, precedes one in which he is urged to destroy *māyā́ḥ* (VI.22.9cd *dhiṣvá vájraṃ dákṣiṇa indra háste, víśvā ajurya dayase ví māyā́ḥ*) -- though see comm. ad loc: a secondary positive reading is also possible. This parallel is an important piece of

evidence for both Old's and Ge's assessment of *māyā́ḥ* here. However, this reasonable interpr. ignores one major factor in our passage: the verb *abhí prá manda*. This lexeme occurs a number of times elsewhere (V.4.1, VII.33.1, VIII.12.13, 93.19), and it is always otherwise positive: act. 'exhilarate', mid. 'become exhilarated'. A negative interpr. of *māyā́ḥ* requires a serious distortion of the meaning of the verb (e.g., Old's 'verwirren', adopted from BR), whereas assuming the *māyā́ḥ* belong to Indra allows it to have a small extension of its usual sense: 'exhilarate' → 'stimulate'. Just as soma exhilarates and stimulates Indra for the Vṛtra-smashing, so does Indra exhilarate and stimulate his own powers. Old in fact previously (ZDMG 55.323) made a good case that the *māyā́ḥ* are Indra's, third in a list of his Kampfmittel that includes the chariot of b and the mace of c, and he suggested a tr. "Setze deine Wunderkräfte in freudige Erregung" very much like mine. He attributes his change of heart in the Noten to VI.22.9 just cited and to his consideration of "Der Gesamteindruck des Auftretens von *māyā́ḥ* in den Indraliedern." But, in fact, he overlooked one very crucial occurrence, in this very hymn: in vs. 12 Indra himself is called *purumāyá-* 'having many magical powers' (cf. also nearby VI.21.2 and 22.1 in this same Indra cycle, also III.51.4). This seems to me clinching evidence against the Ge/Old interpr. of our d: Indra has many *māyǎ-* and he deploys them to achieve his ends. (Gotō [1ˢᵗ Kl., 236 n. 521] finds the passage puzzling, but does try to reconcile it with the usage of the verb, not entirely successfully.)

VI.18.10: The imagery is somewhat mixed here: it is hard to see how either a missile (nom. *aśániḥ*) or a lance (instr. *hetī́* [contra Pp. *hetíḥ*, an old correction]) can *burn down* anything. I assume it's a transferred visual image from the fire simile, since flames can have a lance-like shape and shoot out dramatically.

The fem. instr. adj. phrase *gambhīráya ṛṣváyā* lacks an overt referent. Ge supplies Stimme without disc. In the absence of any obvious choices, I follow Gr in assuming *hetī́* from pāda b. Neither *ṛṣvá-* nor *gambhīrá-* has a standard fem. referent.

The obj. of *rurója* is likewise unexpressed. Ge supplies Burgen (*púraḥ*, a common obj. of this verb), but (n. 10cd) suggests that *rákṣaḥ* from b is also possible. Since the *yó rurója* rel. clause of c is picked up by the main cl. of d, I instead supply *duritā́*, which is the obj. of the conjoined verbs of d. Elsewhere *duritā́* is the obj. of √*han* (IX.62.2, 90.6, 97.16), a verb semantically similar to √*ruj*.

VI.18.11: Gr takes the referent of *yásya* as 'wealth' (see col. 1114, s.v. *yótu-*). But it is far more likely that it is Indra, whom we are urging to come here -- and whose arrival might be threatened by the actions of the ungodly man. (It is not possible to determine from Ge's tr. ("den") what he thinks the referent is.) The relationship between *yāhí* and *yótoḥ* might be clearer if the rel. clause were tr. "… never has the power to keep away."

On *yótoḥ* see now also Keydana (Inf., 77–78), who does not consider it a true infinitive. He takes *yásya* simply as the determiner of a gen. action noun *yótu-*. I am more inclined to see *yótuḥ* as an infinitive, and therefore consider *yásya* as an example of "attraction" to the case of the infinitive from an underlying obj. *yám. The dative to the same stem does function as an infinitive and takes acc. rection: VIII.71.15 *agním dvéṣo yótavai no gṛṇīmasi* (cf. VIII.18.5 *dvéṣāṃsi yótave*).

VI.18.13: This vs. is structurally reminiscent of vs. 8. Like there, we have a clause occupying the first pāda (both ending in *bhūt/bhūt*, as it happens), with (most of) b belonging to a different but radically incomplete clause, containing a marooned set of accusative PNs whose fate at the hands of Indra is well known. Pāda c continues with other accusative victims of Indra, but also provides a verb to govern them. In both vss. the names in the b clause have a well-known and quite specific outcome at Indra's hands: Cumuri and Dhuni in 8b were put to sleep by Indra, to weaken them for a death blow administered by someone else; as for our vs., acdg. to I.53.10 Indra made Kutsa, Āyu, and Atithigva subject (*arandhanāyaḥ*) to Tūrvayāṇa, who also appears by name in our pāda d. In both 8b and 13b the publ. tr. follows the same strategy: co-opting the verb in c (*vṛṇák* in 8, *ní śíśāḥ* in 13) to govern not only the accusatives in its own pāda but also those in pāda b. This is syntactically a bit more complex in our vs. because b is a relative clause (with *yád*) so the unaccented verb of c cannot be applied to it directly. I still think this is the correct strategy in 8 and probably also here as well, but the presence of dat. *asmai* in b along with its likely referent *tūrvayāṇam* in d makes me wonder if Ge (n. 13b) may be right in simply supplying the verb found in the very phrase in I.53.10 *tvám asmai kútsam atithigvám āyúm, … arandhanāyaḥ*, despite the isolation of that passage and its distance from ours. (Alternatively we could use *árdayaḥ*, which governs the same three names in VIII.53.2, but there is no dat. there; and it is likewise isolated and distant.) Old (both ZDMG 55.323 and Noten) is also in favor of supplying such a verb. Note in passing that unaccented *asyai* in our b presupposes a referent already in the discourse, so it must be anticipating *tūrvayāṇam* in d. For Tūrvayāṇa cf. the simile *tūrvan ná yāman* in nearby VI.15.5 with disc. ad loc.

VI.18.14: The aor. subjunctive *kárah* is generally taken as preterital, an interpr. licensed by Gr, who identifies it as "Impf." But this is morphologically irresponsible, and further, given the injunc. *mádan* in the main cl. (b), a proper subj. value is quite possible. I think this is an example of the standard rhetorical move to take Indra's signal mythological deeds and make them a model for his behavior in the future, to our benefit. The next and final vs. continues this point of view. See Hoff (Injunk. 55 and n. 37) for a similar assessment, though he also envisions the possibility of "Konjunktiv im präteritalen Sachverhalt."

VI.19 Indra

This hymn is something of a bricolage, with numerous phrases, pādas, and whole verses borrowed from elsewhere. (I say "borrowed" rather than the more neutral "parallel to," because the sheer number of the matches strongly suggests that there is a magpie quality to the construction of this hymn. For details of the matches, see Ge's nn. (though he doesn't note all of them) and Bloomfield RR.

VI.19.1: The publ. tr. should read "manfully" with adverbial *nṛvát*.
On possible configurations of the terms connected by *utá*, see Klein DGRV I.341.
Gr derives *aminá-* from √*am* ('mächtig andringend, gewaltig'), but it must belong to √*mī* as thematic parallel to *áminant-*. See Old (ZDMG 55.323).

The phrase in d, *súkṛtaḥ kartṛ́bhir bhūt* "he was well made by his makers," is somewhat startling as a description of the great god Indra. Who are his makers? Is this a depiction of his original creation, or does it have a more narrow and current application? Because of the previous pāda, … *vāvṛdhe vīryā̀ya* "he has been strengthened for his heroic deed," I am inclined towards the latter: the soma drinks and ritual activities and praise have made him the consummate heroic actor. The pl. agent noun *kartár-* may refer to the soma drinks or to the priests who prepared and offered them to Indra. Because I think the reference is to the immediate past, I would slightly alter the tr. from "was well made" to "has been well made."

VI.19.1–2: These two vss. show a penchant for synonymous pairs: 1d *urúḥ pṛthúḥ* "wide (and) broad," 2b *bṛhántam ṛṣvám* "lofty (and) towering," *ajáraṃ yúvānam* "unaging (and) youthful."

VI.19.2: *śávasā śūśuvā́ṃsam* "swollen with strength" is an etymological figure, though *śávas-* has lost its tight connection to √ *śū* 'swell'. Both words are reused in this hymn: 6a *śáviṣṭham … śávaḥ* "strongest strength"; 7b, 8b *śūśuvā́ṃsam*.

VI.19.4: Since *śāká-*, so accented, is the adj. 'able', not a noun *śāka-* ability', I supply 'men' on the basis of IV.17.11 *ebhír nṛ́bhiḥ … asya śākaíḥ*.
    With pāda d I supply opt. *syāma*. Cf. II.27.7 *úpa syāma puruvī́rā áriṣṭāḥ*, sim. vs. 16; X.128.3 *áriṣṭāḥ syāma tanvã̀ suvī́rāḥ*.

VI.19.5: The gen. phrase *vāmásya vásunaḥ* in b is difficult to construe. Ge supplies "(Spender)" as its head noun; my tr. assumes that it is a loose genitive specification of the *paśú-* that is lurking in the -*kṣú-* in the bahuvrīhi *puru-kṣú-* 'possessing much livestock'. This interpr. is suggested by the other occurrence of this gen. phrase in VIII.1.31 *utá vāmásya vásunaś ciketati, yó ásti yādvaḥ paśúḥ* "of the valuable goods what will stand out is the livestock coming from Yadu," where the *vāmá- vásu-* is identified as a particular *paśú-*. But the syntax proposed for our passage is sketchy.
    By accent *rāyaḥ* should be nom. pl., not, as I have tr. it, gen. sg. As Ge suggests in his n. 5c, it reads literally "the paths, the riches …" Nonetheless, Old (ZDMG 55.324 and Noten) considers the nom. pl. reading "forced" (gezwungen) and interprets it as a gen. sg. (on the basis in part of VII.18.3 *pathyã̀ rāyáḥ* with a clear gen. sg.). In the ZDMG treatment he explicitly says that emending the accent isn't necessary, though he doesn't indicate why.
    In d Ge suggests a haplology of *samudréṇa ná, with an instr. rather than a loc., as in III.36.7 *samudréṇa síndhavo yā́damānāḥ*, where he proposes a similar haplology. This is possible, but not nec.: I see no reason why rivers can't unite *in* the sea as well as with it. As for III.36.7 see comm. ad loc.; I do not think that a simile particle is necessary there.

VI.19.6–8: As noted in the publ. intro., all three of these vss. contain the phrase "bring here to us": in 6a and 7b *na ā̀ bhara* straddles the early caesura; in 8a *ā̀ no bhara* opens the vs. Since vss. 6–8 are the middle vss. of this hymn, this repeated phrase might identify an

omphalos, but if so it is quite a weak one. The vss. are not particular noteworthy for their content, and the enclosing vss. do not provide the usual frame structure.

VI.19.6: The first hemistich is notable for the superlative etymological figures: double *śáviṣṭham … śávaḥ* "strongest strength" (or, in fact, triple, since *śūra* 'hero' is ultimately related to these words) and triple *ójiṣṭham ójaḥ … ugrám* "mightiest mighty might." The triple etym. connection of the first phrase is better conveyed by Ge's "Bring uns, du Starker, die stärkste Stärke" than by the publ. tr. Note also that the adjacent words in b *ójo abhibhūta* "… might, o overpowering one," though not syntactically connected here, form a bahuvrīhi modifying Indra in the preceding hymn, VI.18.1 *abhíbhūti-ojas-* 'of overpowering strength'.

VI.19.7–8: I tr. *śūśuvā́ṃsam* in both vss. as 'swollen with strength', although the *śávasā* found in 2c is absent, as a portmanteau tr. to capture the full sense of the root. This participle picks up *śáviṣṭham … śávaḥ* in vs. 6.

VI.19.7: On the long root vowel in *jigīvā́ṃsaḥ*, see Old ZDMG 55.324, where on the basis of the metrical evidence he surmises that, at least in this post-caesura position, the form should be read with short root vowel (**jigi-vaṃs-*), the form found in the younger Vedic texts. See also Arnold (Ved. Met. 143), who considers the short-*i* form required in 3 of the 5 occurrences of the strong stem, and Kü (189 n. 225), who considers it proper except in III.15.4. Kü cites Anttila (1969, Schwebeabl. 61) as explaining the lengthening in the Saṃhitā text as analogy to *ninīvā́ṃs-*. However, it is much more likely that it is a morphologically conditioned lengthening, meant to distinguish the *-i-*vowel proper to the root from the *-i-*liaison vowel that has become associated with suffixes/endings. Thus *jigī-vā́ṃs-* with long vowel is kept separate from the type *tasth-ivā́ṃs-*, as I already argued in my 1988 article on the vocalized laryngeal (224–25), though without factoring in the metrical evidence pointing to this lengthening as late and redactional. (Of course, in *tasthivā́ṃs-* the *-i-* would originally have represented the zero-grade of this *-ā́* root, but by synchronic RV it has been reanalyzed as part of the suffix. See disc. in my 1988 art.)

VI.19.8: In d the *utá* is oddly positioned, since it appears to be meant to conjoin *jāmī́n̐r ájāmīn* "kin and non-kin," there being no other likely candidates. Klein (DGRV I.356–57) calls it a "peculiar passage" and classes it with two other examples of what he schematizes as *utá* X Y (/ Z …). The pair *jāmí- ájāmi-* is several times asyndectic (I.111.3, IV.4.5, VI.44.17) as here, so no conjunction is actually necessary, but we can cite nearby VI.25.3 … *jāmáya utá yé 'jāmayaḥ*, where the *utá* is correctly placed. Perhaps our passage is a blend of the asyndectic figure and the "X and which Y" construction in VI.25.3.

VI.19.10: The medial 1st pl. s-aor. opt. *vaṃsīmáhi* contrasts with the active 1st pl. s-aor. subjunctive *váṃsāma* in 8c, but the medial optative must have been modeled on the rhyme form *maṃsīmáhi* in the same metrical position in 7d. The "rest" following *vaṃsīmáhi* may call attention to the verb by isolating it metrically.

Besides this echo, note also *nṛvát*, which replicates *nṛvát* in 1a, and *vāmám* recalling *vāmásya* in 5b, while the gen. *vásvaḥ* is in slight discord with the differently formed gen. *vásunaḥ* in 5b.

The referent of the "both kinds of good[s]" in c is not clear, at least from immediate context. In the very similar passage VII.82.4 *īśānā vásva ubháyasya*, it seems to refer to goods belonging to war and peace; similarly in the next hymn, VII.83.5 y*uváṃ hí vásva ubháyasya rā́jathaḥ*, where a reference to war and peace -- or perhaps to the goods of enemies and of allies -- is likely. In II.9.5 the referent of *ubháyam … vasavyàm* is also open-ended, but Re's suggestion there that it's livestock and offspring is perhaps the most satisfactory. In our passage the nearest contrastive pair is *jāmī́ṃr ájāmīn* "kin and non-kin" in 8c, so perhaps "both kinds of good[s]" refers to the goods belonging to these two groups whom we hope vanquish in battle. Note *vṛtrā́ṇy ubháyāni* "both kinds of obstacles" in 13c, which Ge, persuasively, takes as referring to the "kin and non-kin" of 8d.

The acc. obj. phrase in d, *rátnam máhi sthūrám bṛhántam*, contains an apparent gender clash: *rátna-* is neut., as is *máhi*; *sthūrám* can be either neut. or masc., while *bṛhántam* must be masc. It is tempting to correlate the two genders with the two kinds of goods in pāda c: a "great treasure" (neut.) and "substantial lofty X" (masc.). This might be possible: *sthūrá- bṛhánt-* qualifies masc. *rayí-* in IV.21.4 *sthūrásya rāyó bṛható yá ī́śe* (and cf. X.156.3 *ā́gne sthūráṃ rayím bhara*), and *bṛhánt-* not infrequently modifies *rayí-* (cf., e.g., VI.6.7). Thus, we could assume an underlying *rayím* for the last two adjectives, yielding a tr. "grant a great treasure (and) substantial lofty (wealth)." This might be supported by *rāyā́ … bṛhatā́* in the last pāda of the hymn (13d). Nonetheless, this seems unduly artificial, and I would prefer to assume that at the end of this acc. phrase, encouraged by ambig. *sthūrám*, *bṛhántam* has simply taken its accustomed pāda-final place in Triṣṭubh. As reported by Old (ZDMG 55.325 and Noten), Ludwig suggested *substituting* (that is, emending) *rayím* for *máhi*, a suggestion roundly rejected by Old, who simply says (Noten) that masc. *bṛhántam* is construed with neut. *rátnam*.

VI.19.12: Note a different kind of gender mismatch in pāda a. Though in the idiom with √*man* "consider oneself X" / "be considered as X," X is in the same case as the underlying subject (see, e.g., 7c *maṃsīmahi jigīvā́ṃsaḥ* "we could be considered victors"), here it is construed with an adverbial neut. *máhi*. That this is not necessarily a property of "think oneself great" is shown by I.178.5, VII.98.4 *maható mányamānān* "… those thinking themselves great," with acc. pl. matching the subject of the participle.

VI.19.13: On *vṛtrā́ṇy ubháyāni* "both kinds of obstacles" see comm. ad vs. 10.

VI.20 Indra
On the metrical irregularities in the hymn, see Old ZDMG 55.324 and Noten.

VI.20.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the "ask" in this hymn comes at the beginning, not the end as is more usual. It is also excessively convoluted in syntax and phraseology. (My interpr. of the vs. is in great part guided by Th [Fremdl. 58] and to a certain extent Ge., though as far as I can see Ge simply fails to tr. parts of it.) The actual referent of the

definitional rel. cl. that occupies the first hemistich is not encountered until the second word of pāda b (*rayíḥ*), preceded by a discontinuous simile *dyaúr ná … bhū̆ma* "like heaven the earth," whose first part has been fronted around the rel. prn. *yáḥ*, and by a verb in tmesis, *abhí … tasthaú* "surmounts," whose preverb is stationed after the caesura in pāda a and whose verb form proper opens pāda b. And this is only the beginning!

A first paraphrase of the first hemistich would be "as heaven (surmounts) the earth, the wealth that surmounts …," with "wealth" corresponding grammatically and functionally to "heaven." This first stab makes it immediately clear that we need an acc. obj. in the frame to correspond to *bhū̆ma* in the simile, something that wealth can "surmount." One acc. is obvious: *jánān* at the end of the hemistich. But what do we do with *aryáḥ* at the end of the first pāda? Old (ZDMG 54.169–70) takes it as an acc. pl., tr. "wie die Himmel über der Erde (sollen) die Schätze über den Geizigen (erhaben sein)." However, there is a reasonably well-attested phrase *rā̆yo aryáḥ* "the riches of the stranger" (IV.48.1, VI.14.3, VI.47.9, and esp. VI.36.5; cf. also VI.1.5 and comm. on all those passages). In VI.36.5 it is found in exactly this context: *dyaúr ná bhū̆mābhí rā̆yo aryáḥ* "Like heaven over the earth, sur(mount) the riches of the stranger," with *rā̆yo aryáḥ* an object phrase exactly parallel to *bhū̆ma* in the simile. It therefore seems best here to assume a gapping of acc. pl. *rā̆yaḥ*, whose presence is suggested by the nom. *rayíḥ*, with *aryáḥ* a gen. as elsewhere. Hence "wealth that surmounts (the wealth/riches) of the stranger …"

And what does this "wealth of the stranger" consist of? In all cases it seems to refer to manpower, not to material wealth, and our passage makes this clear by further specifying it as *jánān* 'people(s)'.

As if the poet hadn't misled us enough already with the intertwining of constituents and gapping of a crucial word, he also plants a false cue. The word *bhū̆ma* is of course the acc. sg. to the neut. *n*-stem *bhū̆man-*, as shown esp. by the parallel VI.36.5. But in its position directly after the preverb *abhí*, it looks mighty like a verb -- and could almost (but only almost) be the 1ˢᵗ pl. root aor. *bhūma*, though with wrong accent (expect *bhūmá, a form not found in the RV). The lexeme *abhí √bhū* is close in meaning to the *abhí √sthā* we have here (whose verbal part has been postponed till the 2ⁿᵈ pāda), and given its sandhi form the rel. prn. *yá* (underlying *yáḥ*) could equally be underlying *yé*, which could match the number of the putative 1ˢᵗ pl. verb form ("we who surmount …"). Of course, as just noted, the accent on *bhū̆ma* is wrong, and we would further expect *abhí* to lose its own accent and univerbate with an immediately following verb in a rel. clause. But I nonetheless think that the poet meant for his audience to follow this false trail, however briefly.

After this tangled beginning, the second hemistich is completely straightforward: the acc. *tám* picks up the rel. cl. couched in the nom., with the implicit referent "wealth," modified by three acc. OBJ+VERBAL NOMINAL cmpds, all objects of "give" (*daddhí*). This is the last time in the hymn that Indra is asked to give us anything; the only other appeal to Indra is in 10a, where we pray to "win anew." Almost all of the rest of the hymn treats previous heroic deeds of Indra, though it should be noted that many of these are presented in the injunctive, and the notoriously slippery usage of the injunctive may leave the possibility of current application open.

VI.20.2: This vs. begins like vs. 1, with a form of 'heaven' followed by the simile marker *ná* (1a *dyaúr ná*, 2a *divó ná*). In this case there is nothing in the frame that explicitly corresponds to the gen. *diváḥ* in the simile, though the dat. *túbhyam* is roughly parallel: like the "lordship of heaven," lordship was conceded to you (Indra) and is therefore yours.

The standard idiom for 'concede' is *ánu √dā*, not, as here, *ánu √dhā*. Cf., with phraseology similar to here, VI.25.8 *ánu te dāyi … satrā te víśvam …* (sim. II.20.8). But *√dhā* is also found in this idiom elsewhere, e.g., VI.36.2 *satrā dadhire ánu vīryā̀ya*. Old (ZDMG 55.326, Noten) seems prepared to follow Gr (Tr.) and v. Bradke in emending *dhāyi* to **dāyi*, but this seems unnec. The two roots are formally very parallel and in many contexts their meanings are barely distinguishable; I see no reason why *√dhā* cannot have acquired this idiomatic meaning with *ánu* in imitation of *ánu √dā*. In this particular case *ánu √dhā* may have been used in preference to *ánu √dā* because of the technical use of *anudéya-* in vs. 11 below. See disc. there.

Note that the 'lordship, lordly power' (*asuryà-*) is in the control of the gods and conceded to Indra, another indication that the later Asura/Deva divide is not present in the core RV. See also VI.36.1 below.

VI.20.3: The publ. tr. takes Indra as the subj. of *ā̆vat* in d, with *dartnúm* an action noun "when he aided the splitting …" But, on the basis of other *-(t)nú*-stems (cf. AiG II.2.696–97 and 741–42), *dartnú-* is more likely verbal/agentive ('splitting, splitter') and the subject of *ā̆vat* should then be soma ("the somian honey" *mádhu- sómyá-*). So explicitly Old (ZDMG 55.326, with convincing parallels; Ge appears to follow, though his tr. is more equivocal. I would therefore change the tr. to "when it [=soma] aided the splitter of all the strongholds."

VI.20.4–5: As Ge (n. 4–5) notes, these two vss. probably belong together as an account of the ever-fragmented Śuṣṇa / Kutsa myth, though the connection of the Paṇis (pāda a) to this myth is somewhat uncertain. Old (ZDMG 55.326–27) treats these vss. in detail.

VI.20.4: I read the instr. plurals opening the two hemistichs (*śataíḥ* 4a, *vadhaíḥ* 4c) "vertically" -- that is, as a single NP distributed over two clauses. This seems to be Ge's solution too: "Durch hundert (Streiche) …; durch (deine) Streiche …"; so also Old ZDMG 55.326. The fact that a form of *√pad* needs to be read in pāda c, matching *apadran* in pāda a supports this interpr. It would, however, be possible to interpr. *śataíḥ* as "by the hundreds," referring to the felled Paṇis. So Kü (424).

In the publ. tr. I took the beneficiary of Indra's actions in pāda b to be a single person, "the ten-armed poet" (*dáśoṇaye kaváye*)(so Ge), and since *dáśoṇi-* recurs in 8a apparently qualifying *vetasú-*, I considered this to be a reference to this shadowy Vetasu. But I now think this identification is incorrect or at least misleading. When the word *kaví-* is found in an Indra / Kutsa / Śuṣṇa context it always (in my current view) refers to Uśanā Kāvya, and I believe that to be the case here — strengthened by the fact that the other two occurrences of *arká-sāti-* (I.174.7, VI.26.3) are found with *kaví-* in the Kutsa / Śuṣṇa myth, where the word must surely refer to Uśanā Kāvya. (Old makes the same point, ZDMG 55.326–27.) I therefore now think that "for the poet" means "for Uśanā Kāvya," and "for the ten-armed" is likely a reference to a different person, identified as Vetasu in vs. 8. (Old

considers the additional possibility that *dáśoṇi-* is an epithet of UK, but seems to favor the separation into two individuals.) On the basis of 8a and Ge's disc. there (n. 8), it further seems likely, or at least possible, that *vetasú-* in 8 refers to Kutsa, and therefore in our 4b the two datives refer to Kutsa and UK. I would therefore now alter the tr. to "for the sake of the ten-armed one [=Kutsa?] and of the poet [=Uśanā Kāvya]."

My tr. of *dáśoṇi-* in this vs. and in 8a reflects the current consensus, endorsed by Mayr (EWA s.v. *oṇí-* "offenbar 'Arm'"), that *oṇí-* means 'arm' (as opposed to Gr's 'Schutz' and 'Mutterbrust'), but I think that this interpr. might be ripe for revisiting. The passages are not particularly diagnostic -- the most important evidence is the fact that the stem is generally dual -- and it lacks a clear etymology (though it's sometimes connected with √*av* 'help'). There is also the question of the cmpd. sandhi: if *dáśoṇi-* consists of *dáśa* + *oṇí-*, it should of course come out as **dáśauṇi-*. The *-o-* has been accounted for (see EWA s.v. *oṇí-* [p.c from J. Schindler], Mayr PN s.v. *dáśoṇiya-*) by invoking TS I.2.6.1, where the widely attested mantra *abhí tyáṃ deváṃ savitāram oṇyòḥ kavíkratum* (AV VII.14.1, etc.) instead contains *ūṇyòḥ*. The *ū-* initial would indeed yield the proper sandhi result, but given the otherwise overwhelming attestation of *oṇyòḥ* in the mantra, the TS variant does not have much support. Since at present I don't have a better solution, I stick with 'ten-armed', but consider it quite dubious.

That *arká-sāti* means 'winning of the (sun's) rays' is strongly suggested by *sūryasya sātaú* in the next vs. (5d), though, as Old points out (ZDMG 55.327), it could in addition mean 'winning of the chants'.

I don't understand pāda d, but I would point out that another "insatiable Śuṣṇa" passage also has a mention of mealtime: IV.16.12 *kútsāya śúṣṇam aśúṣaṃ ní barhīḥ, prapitvé áhnaḥ kúyavaṃ sahásrā* "For Kutsa you laid low insatiable Śuṣṇa, who brings bad harvest, with his thousands, before the day's first meal." Perhaps the point is that despite his voraciousness, Śuṣṇa is deprived of his meal by Indra's timely blow. In that case the subj. of *arirecīt … prá* here is Indra, who leaves nothing for Śuṣṇa.

VI.20.5: For the unusual position of *sá* and its rukied initial (*urú ṣá*) see disc. ad VI.2.4.

VI.20.8: This vs. is made difficult both by our very sketchy knowledge of the personnel and the myth and by the syntax. Both Old (ZDMG 55.328–29) and Ge (n. 8) devote considerable space to disc. of it. The vs. seems to pun on PNs in a way discouragingly similar to VII.18, the very obscure account of the Ten Kings battle. The nearby vs. VI.26.4 is of some help in the interpr. of this one, as is X.49.4.

My approach to the vs. partly follows Ge's, but differs in several important ways. Like Ge (who adopted it from Baunack; see his n. 8), I supply a verb of speaking to introduce the second hemistich, which we both take as the direct speech of Indra. (By contrast Old construes *úpa sṛjā* in d as the verb governing the acc. in ab, but given the distribution of the rest of the elements in the vs., esp. the preverb *ā́* opening pāda c, this seems unlikely.) But rather than taking the acc. PNs in ab as the addressees of this speech as Ge does, I construe them (loosely) with the hapax bahuvrīhi *svabhiṣṭí-sumnaḥ* 'having/showing the favor of his dominance', with Vetasu [=Kutsa?] and Tuji as the recipient of this favor. The intens. adj. *tūtuji-* 'thrusting', found elsewhere modifying a

whirlwind (*bhṛmi-* IV.32.2) and a chariot (X.35.6), punningly points to Tuji, who is found in nearby VI.26.4 in the company of Vetasu and Tugra, as here. (In that vs. there is also redupl., but it is located on the verb: *tvám tújim … tūtoḥ* "you strengthened Tuji.")

In that vs. Indra strikes down Tugra for Vetasu (VI.26.4c *tvám túgraṃ vetasáve sácāhan*). I think the same situation is depicted here in cd, though less violently, with Vetasu(-Kutsa) referred to by the adj. *dyótana-* 'brilliant, flashing' expressing a dat. of benefit. In this connection Baunack's adducing (see Ge's n. 8c) of I.63.3 *kutsāya dyumaté* "for heaven-bright Kutsa," another dat. of benefit in the Śuṣṇa myth, is apposite. Ge (also Gr, Mayr PN) takes *dyótanāya* as a PN, but no such person Dyotana is found elsewhere, and in its other two occurrences (I.123.4, VIII.29.2) the stem is an adj. with the expected etymological meaning.

The next question is *íbham*. This is pretty much universally interp. as a PN, referring to another enemy of Indra. This is in part based on X.49.4, where Tugra and one Smadibha are made subject to Kutsa (and the Vetasus [pl.] and Tuji are also found). Old, for ex., considers Ibha here simply a shortening of Smadibha, and the context of the word in our pāda certainly supports a pun on the latter name: (*ā́ túgraṃ śá)śvad íbham* …; cf. X.49.4 (*túgraṃ kútsāya) smádibham*, with the last syllable of the adverb *śáśvad* a close match for the 1st syllable of the PN in X.49.4 (if it is indeed a PN). But *íbha-* is elsewhere in the RV a common noun meaning 'retinue' or 'vassal' (the common denominator being the inferior position vis-à-vis someone in power); cf. also the MIA evidence, such as Pāli *ibbha*. And 'vassal' would be an appropriate word for someone made subject to another -- hence my tr. of the phrase *śáśvad íbham* as "perpetual vassal," referring to Tugra.

Finally, we must deal with the verbal expressions at the end of the vs., *úpa śṛjā iyádhyai*. The first question is what form *sṛjā* represents out of sandhi. The Pp. reads *sṛja*, that is, a 2nd sg. act. impv., with lengthening of the final vowel in the Saṃhitā text. But of course in that case the normal outcome in sandhi should be coalescence into **sṛjeyádhyai*. After some agonizing, Old accepts the Pp interpr. (though he also flirts with a 2nd sg. subj. *sṛjāḥ*), but Ge (n. 8) opts instead for Baunack's suggestion, that the underlying form is *sṛjai*, i.e., a 1st sg. middle subjunctive (so also Lub, though with !). This is the interpr. I have also adopted. Although the 6th cl. pres. *sṛja-* is predominately active, there are a few middle forms; the pf. is about evenly divided between active and middle forms in transitive usage (including several 1st pl. *sasṛjmáhe* with *úpa*), and there are two 1st sg. s-aor. forms *ásṛkṣi* with *úpa* in trans. usage. Taking the form as a 1st sg. also entails the direct-speech interpr. of Baunack/Ge. (It's worth noting as an aside that Sāy. simply glosses *upa sṛja* with *upāsṛjat*, apparently untroubled by matters of sandhi and grammatical identity; this was followed by Gr [Tr.], though unmentioned in the Wö.)

As Old points out (ZDMG 55.328), the lexeme *úpa √sṛj* is often used of releasing / dispatching calves to their mother, and this must account for the simile *mātúr ná*. Although this idiom is generally benevolent, it also emphasizes the hierarchical dependency of the young on their mother, and this would be appropriate for the vassal Tugra's subordinate position with regard to Kutsa.

I take the inf. *iyádhyai* to √*i* 'go', or more particularly to the stem *ī́yate* 'speeds' (√*i* or √*yā*), rather than to √*yā* 'implore, beg' with Lub. It simply completes the action of the main verb "release/depatch them to go …" The preverb *ā́* beginning the 2nd hemistich is

more likely to go with this inf. than with *úpa srjai* (*pace* Gr, also Ge, who thinks [n. 8c] it could go with either one), simply because we'd otherwise expect the order *úpa+ắ* (cf. VIII.27.11 *úpa … ắm̐, ásr̥kṣi …*).

> After all this, the alterations of the publ. tr. would be minimal:
> "Indra showed the favor of his dominance to Vetasu [=Kutsa?] of the ten tricks and ten arms and to the thrusting (Tuji), (saying)
> 'Tugra as perpetual vassal for brilliant (Vetasu=Kutsa?) shall I dispatch, like (calves) to their mother, to speed (to him).'"

VI.20.10: In b *enā* can simply be adverbial, as Ge and KH (Injunk. 168) take it, but it is also regularly used as demonstrative with forms like *námasā* 'homage' (I.171.1, II.23.14, etc.), *sūkténa* 'hymn' (II.6.2), *bráhmaṇā* (IV.36.7), and in this context, where the sacrifice is mentioned (*yajñaíḥ*), I think it likely that the verbal part of the ritual evidenced by the verb *prá … stavante* "they start up the praise" is further specified with the near deictic, referring to this current praise hymn.

> The syntactic relationship between pādas c and d is ambiguous. With Ge, I take d as the main cl., with c dependent on it. But KH (Injunk. 168) takes them as parallel subordinate clauses dependent on b. Either is possible, because the verb of d, *(d)hán*, is initial in the pāda and can owe its accent to that alone.

> Note the allit. in *(śắra)dīr dárd, dhán dắs(īḥ)*, esp. noticeable because it consists of four syllables in a row, belonging to four separate words.

> Old (ZDMG 55.329–30 and Noten) calls *dart* in c into question, arguing that it should be a 2nd ps. and the *-t* is faulty. But there seems no reason not to assume that both *dart* and *(d)han* are 3rd ps. verbs; although Indra is referred to in the 2nd ps. in pāda a, shift between the persons is a commonplace in RVic discourse. Pāda c is identical to I.174.2b, and in that passage the case is more difficult because there the context is entirely 2nd ps. As I argued in the comm. to that vs. (q.v.), the final *-t* there may have been introduced from our passage.

VI.20.11: Pāda c contains one of the three instances of the gerundive *anudéya-* in the RV and the only masc. form -- a form called by Ge "ganz unsicher." This gerundive belongs to the lexeme *ánu √dā* 'hand over, concede' discussed above, ad vs. 2. I have discussed one of the fem. forms *anudéyī* in the difficult hymn X.135 at length ("The Earliest Evidence for the Inborn Debts of a Brahmin: A New Interpretation of R̥gveda X.135." *Journal asiatique* 302.2 [2014]: 245–57). In that article I established that the idiom *ánu √dā* can be further narrowed in certain contexts to mean 'forgive/acquit a debt'; and the debt in question can be referred to with the gerund *anudéya-, -ī*, as (the debt) 'to be acquited'. In X.135.5-6 this debt is actually a reference to the inborn debts of a Brahman, which he must pay off during his lifetime, one of which is the need to provide his ancestors with (grand)sons. As argued in that article (255–56), I think the same sense can be seen in our passage. To cite from the article: "The second half of this verse seems to allude to a complex intergenerational relationship in which Indra intervenes. The god hands over a grandson (*nápāt-*) to his grandfather (*mahé pitré*), a transaction that sounds like a man's fulfillment of his debt to his ancestors by fathering a son, thereby providing them with a grandson. This grandson is said

to be *anudéya-*. I would suggest that the grandson here serves as the concrete manifestation of the debt that is to be acquitted, and the technical term *anudéya-* is therefore applied to him. If I am correct, this is another, though more muted, piece of evidence for the existence of the notion of a man's inborn debt in the Rig Veda."

VI.20.12: This is identical to I.174.9; see comm. on that vs., esp. with regard to *párṣi*.

VI.20.13: Dabhīti is the beneficiary of Indra's putting Cumuri to sleep in VI.26.6. Cumuri's companion Dhuni is found with him in VI.18.8, and in our passage he immediately follows vs. 12, which contains two adj. usages of *dhúni-* 'tumultuous, boisterous'.

       The second hemistich portrays Dabhīti assembling or preparing four different requisites of the sacrifice in four different morphosyntactic expressions: 1) a full participial phrase *sómebhiḥ sunván* "pressing with the soma juices," 2) a bahuvrīhi *idhmábhṛtiḥ* lit. 'having the bringing of the firewood', 3) an *-ín-*stem possessive *pakthī́* 'having cooked food' (based on an unattested **pakthá-* 'cooked food'), and 4) an instr. of accompaniment *arkaíḥ* "along with the chants." The identity of the third has been called into question by Old (ZDMG 55.330, Noten). Though the sandhi form *pakthy* is analyzed by the Pp. as *pakthī́* with the long vowel appropriate to the nom. sg. of an *-ín-*stem, in fact in the cadence it would better be read short (though keep in mind the metrical disturbances throughout the hymn). Old toys with the idea that it has been influenced by the PN *pakthá-* and that it is underlyingly an instr. to the *-ti-*stem *paktí-* 'cooked food', hence **paktī́* with shortening before the following vowel. This seems unnecessarily complex, and the PN *pakthá-* is neither well attested nor found nearby this passage. Since shortening of *-ī́* in hiatus was available for the instr., I see no reason why it shouldn't have been analogically extended to the nom. of an *-ín-*stem in this case. Moreover, I think the morphosyntactic variety just described was deliberate, and replacing 3) with an instr. like that of 4) would disturb the sequence.

VI.21 Indra

VI.21.1: As with hemistich initial #*śataíḥ* … #*vadhaíḥ* in VI.20.4 in the immediately preceding hymn, I take #*imā́ḥ* … #*dhíyaḥ* as a "vertical" NP, "these insights." Their positioning allows them to get out of the way of the intense etym. figure in b: *hávyam* … *hávyā havante*. This figure is complicated by the fact that *hávya-* is used in two slightly different senses, controlled by slightly different constructions of the verb √*hū* / *hvā*. Although the normal object of this verb is a god or other being called upon, very occasionally it can take the call itself as object (see comm. ad IV.23.3), and of course derivatives like *háva(na)-* express the call itself. In our passage *havante* 'they invoke' takes the usual type of object, namely Indra here, who is qualified by the gerundive *hávya-* 'to be invoked'. But the insights (*dhíyaḥ*) themselves are also so qualified; here *hávyāḥ* must mean not 'to be invoked', but 'to be called [=spoken]'. In order to keep the vocabulary constant, I have tr. 'deserving to invoke', in contrast to 'deserving to be invoked' applied to Indra.

       The vertical NP just discussed unbalances syntactic constituency, and, unusually, the hemistich boundary cannot be respected.

In d most take *īyate* to √*yā* / *ī* 'implore, beg'; so, e.g., Ge "… wird … erbeten" (likewise Lub, Kulikov, -*ya*-presents 495). I assign it rather to 'speeds', though either is possible.

VI.21.2: The nominal rel. cl. *yó vídānaḥ*, interrupting a string of accusatives, is syntactically curious. It seems to represent a sort of izafe, rather than a real embedded relative cl. I have tr. it as if acc. *índram* were the predicate of the participle ("who is known as "Indra"), despite the difference in cases. Ge, in contrast: "der bekannt ist." My interpr. might be better represented as "I will praise him — Indra, as he is known — whose …" This interpr. fits well with the doubts expressed about Indra later in the hymn, esp. vs. 4. See also *vídānaḥ* in 12b.

The instr. *gīrbhíḥ* in b might be better construed with the verb *stuṣe* in a: "I will praise him with songs"; it has been displaced to the right to be nearer to *gírvāhasam*.

The second hemistich contains a strikingly mixed construction, with the usual matched pair heaven and earth in two different cases, acc. *dívam*, abl.-gen. *pṛthivyāḥ*, though construed with the same verb. The two different cases are controlled by two different PREVERB + √*ric* combinations, one overt, one implied. Overt is *áti* √*ric* 'extend beyond, surpass', which is rather rare but takes the acc., as in VIII.92.14, 22 *ná tvǎm indrǎti ricyate* "nothing surpasses you, Indra" (cf. also X.90.5); hence our … *dívam áti … riricé*. The implied construction is the more common *prá* √*ric* 'extend beyond' which takes the abl., as in I.61.9 *asyéd evá prá ririce mahitvám, divás pṛthivyāḥ pári antárikṣāt* "his greatness projected beyond heaven and earth, beyond the midspace" (note clear abl. *antárikṣāt*) (cf. also I.59.5, 109.6, etc.), hence our … *pṛthivyāḥ … ririce mahitvám*. Examples of this latter constr. are found in this group of Indra hymns (VI.24.3, 30.1), and despite the absence of *prá* here it is not surprising that the abl. construction would creep in.

VI.21.3: On the meaning of *vayúna-*, see comm. ad II.34.4.

As has long been known, the desid. stem *íyakṣ-* belongs to √*naś* 'attain', not (*pace* Gr) √*yaj* 'sacrifice'. See, inter alia, EWA s.v. *NAŚ* [1].

The question in the 2nd hemistich seems like a non sequitur, which makes me somewhat sympathetic to Sāy's reading as a (negative) indefinite: *kadā cid* "they do not ever violate …" But this reinterpr. is arbitrary, of course, and further, the *kadǎ* question inaugurates a series of questions in vs. 4, each with a *ka-* form: a *kúha*, b *kám … kǎsu*, c *káḥ*, d *káḥ … katamáḥ*. It may be that we have to ask about the whereabouts of Indra in vs. 4 because he has ceased to appear to us because we have (or may have) violated his ordinances.

VI.21.4: -*tama*-forms implicitly index a referent among three or more possibilities. The interrog. *katamá-* here echoes *purutáma-* of 1a. I have chosen to render *katamá-* with the heavy tr. 'which of many' because in this series of questions the poet is anxiously surveying all the possible sacrifices and sacrificers who may have attracted Indra away from us.

VI.21.5: The *utá* in the middle of pāda c uncomplicatedly conjoins the temporally contrastive *madhyamāsaḥ* "the middle ones, those in between" and *nūtanāsaḥ* "the current

ones" (see Klein DGRV I.301, 311), but the one beginning pāda d, in Klein's words (DGRV I.382) "introduc[es] a new nonparallel clause." It is not represented in the publ. tr., which should perhaps read "And … take cognizance of the one who is closest." The reason for this apparently pleonastic conjunction may be that "the closest one" (singular *avamá-*) is not only a subset of "the current ones" (plural *nū́tanāsaḥ*), but the climax of the series of temporally sorted comrades.

VI.21.6: This ultimate insider, "the closest one" of 5d, is immediately picked up by the slightly more distanced "closer ones" (*ávarāsaḥ*) in 6a. Here their comparative closeness is not contrasted with previous generations of Indra's comrades, as in vs. 5, but with the older, distant deeds of Indra. These closer one are "asking" (*pṛchántaḥ*) about Indra. Their asking may refer directly to the questions in vs. 4, but it also implies that, however "close" they are, they do not have direct access to knowledge about Indra.

  The limits on our knowledge are explicitly acknowledged in the 2nd hemistich, where we praise Indra only insofar as know him (*yắd evá vidmá*). This subordinated expression is embedded in the larger clause: *árcāmasi …, yắd evá vidmá tắt tvā mahāntam*, where the obj. of *árcāmasi* is *tvā*, but the *yắd … tắd* diptych is clearly formulaic and frozen. This expression reminds us slightly of the *yó vídānaḥ* of 2b, likewise with √*vid* 'know' and likewise technically embedded.

VI.21.7: JPB suggests that the "face of the demon" spreading out against Indra is hood of the cobra, namely Vṛtra.

  The referent of the expression beginning b, *máhi jajñānám* "having been born great," is entirely ambiguous. It may be, as the publ. tr. takes it, an acc. with *tvā*, referring to Indra. Or it may be, as Gr and Ge take it, a neut. nom. modifying the neut. *s*-stem *pắjaḥ*. Technically speaking, of course, *máhi* is neut. and might therefore give weight to the latter possibility. But *máhi* can be adverbial here, evoking the apparently fixed expression *máhi jātám* (I.163.1, III.31.3, cf. I.156.2); cf. also V.60.3 *máhi vṛddháḥ* 'grown great'. I now think the ambigity is meant, and the phrase can apply to either of the antagonists (or rather, in the case of the *rakṣás-*) its visage. The ambiguity is hard to convey in tr.; perhaps "… (each) born great."

  The two verbs in the first hemistich, *abhí … ví tasthe*# and *… abhí … tiṣṭha*#, belong to the same root (√*sthā*), are positioned identically, and differ fairly minimally from each other: tense-aspect stem, voice, person, as well as an extra preverb with the first. Unfortunately the etymological connection can't be easily capture in tr.: "has stood wide against you" is unidiomatic and opaque.

  The 2nd hemistich seems implicitly to convey that our anxieties about our intimacy with Indra were well-founded. In 5ab our forebears were identified as Indra's "ancient comrades" (*pratnāsaḥ … sákhāyaḥ*), with later generations apparently grandfathered into this select group (5cd). But here we learn who Indra's "ancient comrade" really is — his mace: *táva pratnéna yújyena sákhyā vájreṇa*.

VI.21.9: The use of parallel and etymologically related purpose datives *ūtáye* and *ávase*, stationed in the a and b pādas respectively, seems pleonastic. I have tr. one as nominal and one as infinitival, but this distinction rests on nothing in the passage.

VI.21.10: Like 1b, pāda c here contains an extravagant etymological figure based again on √*hvā* 'call': *hávam (ă) huvató huvānáḥ*.
    The phrasing of d also seems awkwardly pleonastic -- *ná tvǎvāṁ anyáḥ .. tvád asti* "no one like you exists, other than you" -- in comparison with the usual expression, found in nearby VI.30.4 *ná tvǎvāṁ anyó asti* "there exists no one else like you" (cf. VII.32.23).

VI.21.11: In c Ge tr. *āsúḥ* as if it were a present: "die Agni zur Zunge haben und die Wahrheit pflegen." Although this is contextually tempting, the pf. of √*as* is never presential. Cf. Kü (111): "Es ist stets (zumindest auch) vergangenheits bezogen gebraucht." At best we could render it "who have (always) had Agni as their tongue …"; this might in fact be better.
    In any case the pf. *āsúḥ* in c matches *cakrúḥ* in d, and this latter action appears to be one in the distant past -- even though it's not entirely clear what action it refers to. Interpr. is not helped by the fact that *dása-* is a hapax, though it is reasonable, with Ge (n. 11d), to take it as "der mythische Stammvater der Dāsa's oder Dasyu's," or indeed referentially identical with the well-attested stem *dāsa-* referring to some variety of enemy to the Ārya (see Old, etc.). But what the relationship between Manu and Dasa is in this passage and what the gods were attempting to bring about are both unclear -- an unclarity also facilitated by the ambiguity of *úpara-*, which can mean, inter alia, 'lower', 'closer', or 'later'. The publ. tr. "… put Manu very close to Dasa" is opaque; in fact I do not now know what I meant by it. Ge takes *úpara-* as 'later' and assumes that the gods made Manu Dasa's successor (Nachfolger). I am now inclined towards Old's solution, however: that the gods put Manu below (the 'lower' sense of *úpara-*) in the earthly region "for Dasa," with the dative of malefit, not benefit: they set Manu to do to Dasa whatever he deserved.

VI.21.12: *vídānaḥ* in b reprises *yó vídānaḥ* in 2a and thus forms a weak ring.

VI.22 Indra

VI.22.1: To add to the similarities between VI.21 and VI.22 noted in the publ. intro., *hávya-* is applied to Indra in the first pāda here, recalling 22.1b *hávyam .. hávyā havante*; note also *purumāyá-* in b, a descriptor of Indra also in VI.21.2d (as well as nearby VI.18.12).
    On *sátvan-* see comm. ad I.173.5.

VI.22.2: The vs. lacks an overt finite verb. With Ge I supply a form of √*arc*, picking up the main clause verb of vs. 1, *abhy àrca* of 1b. The instr. *matíbhiḥ* in our d is parallel to *gīrbhíḥ … ǎbhíḥ* of 1b.
    The "seven inspired poets" (*saptá víprāsaḥ*) evokes the Saptarṣi, the "seven seers." I am not certain whether the phrase here refers to the Saptarṣi and, further, whether they are identical to the Navagvas. It is worth noting IV.42.8 *asmǎkam átra pitáras tá āsan, saptá*

ŕṣayaḥ "Our forefathers, the Seven Seers, were here," with *pitáraḥ*, as here, as well as IX.92.2 *ŕṣayaḥ saptá víprāḥ*, where the Seven Seers are identified as *vípra-*s.

The interpr. of the cmpd *nakṣad-dābhá-* given in the publ tr., 'who catches up to the cheat', cannot be correct. That tr. assumed a structure of the verbal governing cmpd type, like *bharád-vāja-*, but the accent is wrong. I therefore now see that a conventional tatpuruṣa interpr., with the 2nd member an agent nominal governing the first, should be the correct interpr.; so Gr 'den Nahenden vernichtend', Ge 'der den Einholenden (?) täuscht'. (Curiously AiG does not seem to comment on this cmpd, despite its somewhat aberrant form) The cmpd thus conforms to the type *hasta-grābhá-* 'grasping the hand', at least as to its 2nd member, but the first member appears to be the weak form of the pres. part. to the pres. *nákṣati* (√*nakṣ* 'approach, reach'). I do not know, offhand, of any cmpds formally so constructed, and I am further puzzled by the apparent sense 'tricking / cheating / outwitting the one who approaches'. Forms of the root √*nakṣ* generally have benevolent sense, as in the medial *nákṣate* in this very hymn (5d), where the song 'catches up' to Indra, or act. *nákṣanti* in this same Indra cycle, VI.34.3, where thoughts and voices approach Indra, strengthening him, so there is no apparent reason for Indra to √*dabh* someone innocently coming up to him. I would emend the tr. to "him who outwits the one(s) approaching," but still feel that the first member is concealing something I can't crack. Some light on the cmpd may be shed by the verb forms *ānaśúḥ* and *nákṣate* in the following vss. (4b and 5d respectively; see below), and this set of vss. seem to share preoccupations and themes.

Note the presence of both √*dabh* 'trick, cheat'and √*druh* 'deceive, lie', with Indra depicted as engaging in the former activity, but possessing speech that is *ádrogha-* 'undeceptive'. In 8a he attacks the "deceitful people" (*jána- drúhvan-*).

VI.22.3: The lack of accent on the demon. in the phrase *asya rāyáḥ* is notable. Ge tr. "um solche Reichtum," clearly taking *asya* as modifying *rāyáḥ*, and Old (ZDMG 61.828 [=KlSch 259]) defends a similar interpr., saying "der weitere Verlauf schildert dann den Reichtum ausführlicher." However, unaccented oblique stems of *ayám* are ordinarily pronominal, and that interpr. is readily available here: the *asya* can refer to Indra, who immediately precedes in a different case (*índram*).

On the *yáḥ* of pāda c as breaking the pattern established earlier in the hymn of reference to Indra, see the publ. intro.

VI.22.4: Although there is no overt mark, I take initial *tán no ví vocaḥ* as a question (contra Ge), matching the overt questions in cd and introducing the indirect question in the *yádi* clause; see also *pṛchántī* in the next vs. and the questions in the previous hymn, VI.21 3–4, 6).

The poet seems to be harking back to vs. 2 in 4ab and vs. 3 in 4cd. In vs. 2 the ancestral poets praised Indra, but the god is described as *nakṣad-dābhá-* 'outwitting the one(s) approaching'. Here the poet asks if previous singers obtained (*ānaśúḥ*) Indra's favor. Although this pf. belongs to the root √*(n)aś* 'attain, reach', which is synchronically separate from √*nakṣ* 'approach', the latter root is a fairly transparent enlargement or development of the former (see EWA s.v. NAŚ[1], p. 28; Narten, SigAor. 160, Gotō, 1st Kl., 192), and, of course, some forms of √*(n)aś* have the root syllable *nakṣ* (e.g., desid. *ínakṣati*, though see

íyakṣati in the previous hymn, VI.21.3). I therefore suggest that *ānaśúḥ* implicitly responds to *nakṣat-* in 2c. With my new (and, I hope, more accurate) interpr. of *nakṣad-dābhá-* in 2c, I now think that vs. 2 implies that Indra may deviously rebuff the attentions of his praisers and have done so even to the legendary poets of the past. Here the poet directly asks the question if these previous poets (/singers) actually obtained (*ānaśúḥ*) the favor they sought in approaching (*nakṣat-*) Indra, whose benevolence cannot be taken for granted.

In the 2nd hemistich the questions turn to Indra's portion (*bhāgá-*) and his vital energy (*váyaḥ*) in battle, but also refers to the wealth he may bring. The two cmpds *púruhūta purūvaso* respond to *puruvī́rasya .. purukṣóḥ* in 3d.

The voc. *khidvaḥ*, presumably to a *-vant*-stem **khídvant-* (AiG II.2.896, or, less likely, **khídvan-* or **khidvāṃs-*), belongs to the synchronic root √*khid*, which, despite its relative rarity, displays a variety of senses centered around aggressive action. Since this stem is a hapax, it's difficult to know which of the senses is reflected here; Gr renders as 'drängend (so also EWA s.v. *KHED*), bedrängend, Ge 'Abzwacker'. The only RVic nominal form to this root is *khédā* (3x), which in its clearest occurrence (VIII.76.3) means 'hammer' or the like. I have evoked this sense here, in the English idiom 'hammer-head', thus forming an unjustified etym. figure in tr. "headstrong hammer-head" -- 'headstrong' representing *dudhra*. Although the standard tr. are safer, the fact that the form is a hapax to a poorly attested root invites a more noticeable tr. than 'pressing'.

I follow W. E. Hale (*Ásura-*, 65) in taking *asura-* in *asurahán-* as referring to human 'lords' who lead forces inimical to us.

VI.22.5: This vs. is beset with difficulties, starting with the syntax, on which see Old. The major problems are that there is no finite verb until *iṣe* in d and that it is unclear what the limits are of the rel. cl. marked by *yásya* in b. If we follow Old's first option, that the rel. cl. occupies pādas a-c, the rel. prn. (towards the end of b) is positioned far too deeply in the clause. His 3rd option envisions a discontinuous rel. cl. partly embedded in and partly following the main cl., with the rel cl. verb being *nákṣate* in d -- a syntactic configuration that is simply impossible. His 2nd option, basically adopted by Ge as well, takes the rel. cl. as limited to *vépī vákvarī yásya nū́ gī́ḥ*. This is more acceptable, though the rel. cl. would be definitely embedded, not only in the main clause but within a long acc. NP (*tám … índram* [REL CL] *tuvigrābhám …*). My own solution is similar to this, but limits the rel. cl. to *yásya nū́ gī́ḥ*; this not only better accounts for the position of the particle *nū* but also diminishes the effect of the embedding, because brief nominal rel. clauses, roughly equivalent to izafe constructions, seem to be at least marginally acceptable in RVic syntax. See esp. *yó vídānaḥ* in the previous hymn, VI.21.2. Scar's (208) tr. appears to follow the same analysis, with the rel. cl. limited to "[das Lied,] das nun ihm gehört …"

The root noun cmpd *rabhodā́-* is glossed by Scar (208) in the first instance as 'Ungestüm, Gewalt, Kraft gebend, aufnehmend', leaving it undetermined whether Indra bestows or assumes *rábhas-*, a question that Scar discusses in some detail without coming to a definite conclusion. Since, as Scar notes, there are several good exx. of *rábhas-* and related words as objects of medial *ā́* √*dā* 'take, assume' (e.g., I.145.3) and since the pāda in which the adj. is found seems to depict Indra on a rampage (*tuvigrābháṃ tuvikūrmím* "powerfully grasping, powerfully ranging"), the medial 'assume' value makes the most

sense. Although ideally we might want the preverb *ā́* represented, root noun cmpds with the structure NOUN–PREV-√ seem to be rare to non-existent. (Cmpds of the type *tveṣá–saṃ-dŕ̥ś-* in 9b below aren't counterexamples, because, as the accent shows, the root noun cmpd *saṃdŕ̥ś-* has been in turn incorporated into a bahuvrīhi), and in any case the outcome of *rabhas–ā-dā́-* would be hard to parse once sandhi rules had applied.

The verb of the main clause must be *iṣe* in d, but what it represents is uncertain. Gr (Nachtr., 1755) assigns it to √*iṣ* 'send', identifying it as a 1ˢᵗ sg.; Old tr. as 3ʳᵈ sg. 'er regt sich … an', which I assume means that he assigns it to √*iṣ* 'send', though he doesn't comment on either root affiliation or morphology. Ge suggests a 3ʳᵈ sg. either to √*i* (built like *stuṣe*, acdg. to him, though *stuṣe* is overwhelmingly *first* sg.) or to √*iṣ* (which √*iṣ* he doesn't say, though his tr. 'sucht' suggests √*iṣ* 'seek'). Lub gives *iṣe* as an independent lemma (p. 321), with a question mark, no gloss, and 4 occurrences. As my tr. 'seeks' indicates, I think it belongs to √*iṣ* 'seek' and is a 3ʳᵈ sg. A number of other forms to this root take *gātúm* 'way' as obj. (pres. *ichá-* I.80.6, IV.18.10, VI.6.1; pf. *īṣ-* I.112.16, III.1.2). But what is the form? Almost the only way to get a 3ʳᵈ sg. in *-e* (outside of archaic forms like *duhé*) is in the perfect, and as we just saw, other forms of the pf. of this root take the same object. I suggest that we do, or did, have a pf. here, whose expected form would be **īṣe*. This putative form with heavy root syllable would in fact work metrically here. See also IV.23.6, where I suggest the same underlying form for the transmitted form with light root vowel; the suggested long vowel is a significant metrical improvement in that passage. There are several ways to explain the short vowel. On the one hand, it can be wrongly extracted from combinations with preverbs like *upeṣé* in I.129.8, whose correct analysis is *upa īṣé*, but could also in principle contain **iṣé*. On the other hand, the dat. *iṣé* to the root noun *íṣ-* 'refreshment', found in nearby VI.13.2, 17.14, might have influenced it.

Stepping back from the formal difficulties of the vs., we can try to fit its contents into the context of the hymn. The vs. seems to express the same questioning anxiety as vs. 4: do the singers -- and their song -- succeed in reaching Indra and attaining his good opinion, or does he respond to their approach with disdainful tricks? While asking this question, the song seeks her way and approaches what sounds like an intimidatingly formidable Indra, hoping for acceptance and favor. That we have moved from the plural male poets/singers of vss. 2 and 4 to the lone female song (fem. *gī́ḥ*) makes the mismatch of power all the clearer. The verb *nákṣate* in the final clause brings us back to *nakṣad-dābhá-* in vs. 2.

VI.22.6: Indra's overwhelming power, viewed with some apprehension in the previous vss., is a positive force when it is exercised for our benefit against external foes, and the hymn now turns to this happier theme.

The publ. tr. assigns the instr. phrase *ayā́ … māyáyā* "with this magic power" to Indra, whereas Ge and Old assume that the phrase goes with *vāvr̥dhānám* and refers to Vr̥tra's *māyā́*; Old is in fact quite scornful of the former interpr. However, see comm. ad nearby VI.18.9, where I argue that Indra is regularly credited with *māyā́* in this Indra cycle. See, e.g., 1d in this hymn and 2d in the previous one (VI.21.2), both with *purumāyá-* qualifying Indra. It is also the case that this hymn contains hostile *māyā́*; see 9d. I therefore now think that *māyayā* in this vs. has double application. Its tight embedding in the acc. phrase *tyám māyáyā vāvr̥dhānám* does suggest that it belongs to Vr̥tra, but the initial near-

deictic *ayā́*, outside that NP, refers, in my opinion, to "this (*māyā́*) right here" -- namely Indra's. I would therefore amend the tr. to "With this (magic power of yours) right here … (you shattered) him who had grown strong with his magic power."

The identification of the vajra with "the mountain that has the speed of thought" goes back to Sāy.

Though the first hemistich lacks a verb, it is easy enough to supply 'shattered' from *rujó ví* in the 2nd half-vs.

VI.22.7: The predicated inf. *paritaṃsayádhyai* has no clear subject, but *vaḥ* must serve in this capacity, referring to the poets, who will perform this action with "their newer insight" (*dhiyā́ návasyā*). The model for this action is the previous poets referred to in 2ab who praised and stimulated Indra, here represented by the adverbial *pratnavát* 'in the ancient way, as the ancients did'. The force of *pari-* in the infinitive must be to indicate that poets from all competing groups will try to pull Indra to their side.

Ge renders *animāná-* as 'ohne Vorbild' (pattern, model), but there seems to be no support for this tr. The only occurrence of *ní √mā* that I know of in the RV is in the enigmatic creation hymn III.38.7d *ní … mamire*, where it is paired with *ā́ … mamire* (7a), with both verbs referring to the 'measuring out' of creation and created things. There is another occurrence of the negated adj. *animāná-* in I.27.11, but nothing in that passage pushes the word to mean anything beyond 'without measure'.

VI.22.9: The lexeme *ví dayate* is often used positively, of distributing good things to deserving people; cf., e.g., III.2.11 *vásu rátnā dáyamāno ví dāśúṣe* "distributing goods and treasures to the pious man." However, a few passages are, or can be, negative, esp. III.34.1 *dáyamāno ví śátrūn* "fragmenting his rivals" (probably also IV.7.10). Here the dominant sense must be negative and the wiles must be Vṛtra's (and perhaps those of other enemies) — though a positive spin is just possible as a second reading: "distributing your magic wiles," that is, deploying his own *māyā-s* widely. See comm. ad VI.18.9 on Indra's use of his *māyā́-s* in combat.

VI.22.10: The main cl., occupying the first hemistich, has no verb; I supply *dhiṣvá* from 9a, though any verb of providing, giving, bringing would work as well (see Ge's "bring").

The contrastive pair *dā́sa- ā́rya-*, juxtaposed in c, is a species of merism that would seem to encompass all the types of human obstacles we might encounter; *nā́huṣāṇi* in d appears to be an afterthought that focuses our enmity on a defined group within the larger whole.

VI.23 Indra

For the repetitive lexicon and the unusual amount of linkage between vss., see publ. intro.

VI.23.1: The rendering of *nímiśla-* as 'intertwined' may be a bit over the top, but 'attached to' or 'linked to' is too anodyne; assuming an underlying sense 'mixed', the point is that Indra can't be separated from the substances and words offered to him in the ritual.

The standard NP *suté sóme* is polarized at the boundaries of pāda a, allowing *sóme* to directly adjoin its rhyme form (and ritual partner) *stóme* over the pāda boundary -- a simple but effective use of word order.

VI.23.2: The gen. phrase *dákṣasya bibhyúṣaḥ* is troublesome, as it is not clear who or what it refers to or what its syntactic function is. Old interpr. it as a "dativischer Gen.," though he gives no tr. But Ge seems to take it as a gen. absolute: "während der Entschlossene Furcht hatte." In either case *dákṣa-* seems to be taken as an adj. qualifying a human and this fearful human is taken to be one on our side, aided either directly (datival gen.) or indirectly (gen. abs.) by fearless Indra. In this passage the single 'skillful' (or ''determined': Ge's 'entschlossen') person would presumably be the soma-presser (*súṣvi-*) of ab, and this is not impossible. However, although there are a few undoubted exx. of adjectival *dákṣa-* 'skillful' (e.g., I.51.2 *dákṣāsa ṛbhávaḥ*), in most clear exx. the stem is a masc. abstract 'skill, abillity', and in doubtful cases I prefer to seek such a meaning. Here I suggest that the "fearful skill" belongs to Indra's enemies, the *dásyūn* of d, and depicts their fading confidence in their skill or ability to counter Indra. Under this interpr. it can either be a gen. abs. with Ge (though this construction is rare at any stage and is supposed not to exist before Vedic prose; see Delbrück, AIS 389–90) or is a gen. of quality (although this construction is also marginal) with *dásyūn* "the Dasyus of frightened skill." The publ. tr. represents an absolute interpr.; the gen. of quality might be a better analysis, but is difficult to render in Engl., as the tr. just given shows (better "of daunted/craven skill," but this would lose the etymological figure). (Kü's [336] tr. avoids the problem, but unfortunately only by an unusual grammatical lapse on his part: he explicitly identifies *bibhyúṣaḥ* as acc. pl., which it could be, but tr. the phrase *dákṣasya bibhyúṣaḥ* as a single NP ["für den Geschickten die sich fürchtenden"] apparently failing to remember that *dákṣasya* requires the whole phrase to be gen. sg. He takes this supposed acc. pl. as parallel to *śárdhataḥ*, which he separates from *dásyūn* and takes as another qualifier of those aided by Indra. His full tr. is "Oder wenn du für den Geschickten die sich fürchtenden furchtlos unterwarfst für den Kühnen, Indra, die Dasyus." The misparsing of *dákṣasya* excludes this tr.)

VI.23.3–4: The alternation of root-accented *-tar-* agent nouns and redupl. agentive *-i*-stems, both with verbal rection, is a distinctive characteristic of these two vss.

VI.23.5: The first pāda contains an example of an embedded relative that is difficult to sidestep: in *ásmai vayáṃ yád vāvāna tád viviṣma* the first two words dat. *ásmai* and nom. *vayám* rightly belong to the main cl. *tád viviṣma* "we toil at that," which follows the dependent cl. *yád vāvāna* "what he holds dear." The two preposed pronouns set the participants and case roles for the vs. (see esp. *índrāya* opening b and d, as well as the two 1st pl. verbs *viviṣma* and *stumasi*) -- hence my tr. as a cleft construction -- but the construction still seems unusual.

The opening of c, *suté sóme stumasi*, takes the same elements found in the figure in vs. 1ab and plays on different phonological similarities. Here *sut(é)* and *stu(masi)* are scrambled versions of each other, while *sóme* stands somewhat apart.

VI.23.6: The first hemistich can be interpr. as a rough repair of the problematic 5a: what Indra holds dear (5a) are the formulations that he makes strengthening for himself (6a), and this is what we have toiled for (6b), with *viviṣmaḥ* in a syntactically more orthodox position than in 5a. (6a also of course is responsive to 5d.)

The phrase opening the 2nd hemistich, *suté sóme sutapā́ḥ*, echoes 5c, with *sut(apā́ḥ)* an anagram of *stu(masi)*.

The referent of the acc. pl. neut. adjs. in cd is unspecified; either the pressings or the formulations -- or, better, both -- would work. Both are elsewhere qualified as *śáṃtama-*: cf. VIII.33.15 *sávanā santu śáṃtamā* and V.73.10 *imā́ bráhmāṇi várdhanā … santu śáṃtamā.*

A rare ex. of variant readings, the hapax *rā́ṇḍya-/rā́ndrya-* is unclear. Ge refuses to tr. it. The publ. tr. 'enjoyable' (which should be marked with ?) rests on Hoffmann's suggestion (reported in EWA s.v. *rā́ṇḍya-*), deriving it from √*raṇ* (or √*ram*). Certainty of course is impossible, but some such meaning fits the context.

vákṣaṇa- in d serves as a synonymous substitute for *várdhana-* (5d, 6a).

VI.23.7: Note pleonastic #*urúm … ulokám*#.

VI.23.8: As in III.41.6 (=VI.45.27) *mandasvā* is not accented despite following *hí*; see comm. ad III.41.6. I have no explanation (nor does Old, despite his ref. to himself). It can be noted that in all three passages the *hí* occurs in 3rd position, after the verb (all three identically *sá mandasvā hí*), but this position is not sufficient to explain the lack of accent, since *hí* elsewhere occurs after its accented verb (e.g., I.2.4 *índavo vām uśánti hí*# ; cf., e.g., I.105.18, 131.6, III.14.5, 26.8, VII.3.3, 23.5, 59.5, VIII.21.18, IX.85.2, X.30.12, 34.11). Note esp. I.189.6, IX.49.4, X.68.7, where *hí* is in 3rd position after the verb as here. Since *hí* often appears after initial accented verbs -- for 2nd sg. med. impvs. like *mandasvā* see the numerous exx. of #*yukṣvā hí* (I.10.3, etc.) -- it might be possible to construct a scenario wherein when such an impv. is displaced from initial position by the pronoun *sá*, it loses its accent by some sort of syntactic analogy. But I find this unlikely: RVic poets are quite sensitive to their accent rules.

Pāda c lacks a verb, but the close parallelism of b and c (*prá […] imé*) and the semantic connection of the two nom. pl.s *yajñā́saḥ* and *hávāsaḥ* impose *aśnuvantu* from b.

In c the 1st pl. prn. *asmé*, which could be either dat. or loc., doesn't work very well as either. Ge tr. "von uns," which makes contextual sense but ill fits either possible case form. The publ. tr. takes it as loc., though the tr. is awkward.

I don't know why the modal temperature has been raised, as it were, by precative *yamyā́ḥ* in d -- though it is the case that there are no 3rd sg. root aor. impvs. attested to √*yam*, perhaps because a putative **yaṃtu* or **yantu* would coincide with the much more common 3rd pl. root pres. impv. to √*i* 'go'.

VI.23.9: Once again a dependent clause seems to follow fronted portions of the main clause, in this case *tám vaḥ sakhāyaḥ*. (Although *vaḥ sakhāyaḥ* could belong semantically in the dependent clause, their lack of accent requires them to follow along with *tám*, or so it seems to me.) As in 5a the fronted material seems to establish the participants in the rest of

hemistich: the god and the worshipers. The acc. *tám* is then doubled by both *īm* and the real referent *índram* in the main clause of b.

The foregoing assumes that the ellipsis of the verb in pāda a is not to be filled with a verb that could take *tám* as object or goal. I have in fact tried to find such a verb that an audience would supply when confronted with *sám … sutéṣu*, but I have not been able to come up with a plausible one. The most likely verb to supply is √*as*, esp. given 5d *yáthāsat*, 9c *ásati*, and 10c *ásad yáthā*. Ge supplies "sich ergötze," presumably a form of √*mad* or √*mand*, which would work contextually. But there is no positive evidence for this conjecture (unlike the three subjunctive forms of √*as* with *yáthā* just cited), and both roots are only marginally construed with *sám*.

VI.23.10: I would slightly change the tr. of the loc. absol. to 'has been pressed' or 'was pressed' to accord better with the immediate past of the hymn-summary verb *astāvi*.

Klein (DGRV I.442–43) interpr. *maghónaḥ* as acc. pl. ("the liberal ones"), which it could be morphologically, but √*kṣi* 'rule over' always takes the gen. (Gr gives one passage with supposed acc., V.37.4, but it belongs to the etymologically separate root √*kṣi* 'dwell', and in any case in that passage I do not construe the acc. with that verb.)

The *utá* in c is troubling: it does not seem to conjoin anything and it seems randomly positioned in the pāda. Klein groups it with a small set of passages where he thinks *utá* means '(and) also, as well', and he suggests that it focuses on the immediately preceding word *jaritré* 'singer', who will also receive patronage from Indra, in addition to the soma-presser in 9d. I find this unpersuasive, though I don't have an altogether better solution. One possibility is that we should supply the nom. sg. corresponding to gen. sg. *maghónaḥ* of b, namely **maghávā*, and *utá* would conjoin this supplied noun with *sūríḥ*. This would change the tr. to "so that he will be (liberal [/a benefactor]) and a patron to the singer." A slightly different solution, but still with the supplied **maghávā*, would be to take *utá* as starting a new clause, with *sūríḥ* qualifying Indra, yielding a tr. "so that he [=the liberal mortal of b] will be (liberal) to the singer, and Indra (will be) a patron and giver of wealth …" Indra is called a *sūrí-* in this Indra cycle (VI.29.5=37.5) and elsewhere. This second suggestion is probably less disruptive to the syntax than the first one, but I weakly favor the first because *sūrí-* is more often used of human patrons than of gods.

VI.24 Indra

VI.24.1: In the publ. tr. *ślóka-* is rendered as 'noise', but I would now alter that to the sense I usually give that word, 'signal call' (see comm. ad I.51.12) -- namely the noise that emanates from the sacrifice, often made by the pressing stones, to alert the gods that the sacrifice is underway. Of course, it is possible here that it refers to more general noise (as in the Engl. expression "joyful noise") associated with the sacrifice.

In the publ. tr. I give full lexical value to the expression *sácā sómeṣu* as "when the soma juices are in his company." This is certainly possible, but, as noted in the comm. ad IV.31.5, *sácā* with loc. often lacks lexical value and simply signals an absolute (or absolute-like) construction. Here I might substitute the tr. "when the soma juices (are pressed)."

Ge seems to take *nŕbhyaḥ* as a beneficial dat. ("für die Männer"), but it is more likely that it is an agent with the gerundive, since such formations do take dat. agents. (See my "Case of Agent …") It is possible, however, that I've misinterpreted his tr. "… ist er … für die Männer zu preisen," and it's actually the equivalent of an English "for … to" construction ("for the men to praise"), which would give it agentive value.

VI.24.2: The bahuvrīhi *urvyũtiḥ*, matching 1d *ákṣititotiḥ* at pāda end, is morphologically problematic. It must be read as a quadrisyllable, and, further, the 2ⁿᵈ vowel must be short (*urvĭ(y)-ūtiḥ*) in the Triṣṭubh cadence. (The Pp. reads *urví 'ūtiḥ*.) Old simply remarks of it that the expected form **urú-ūtiḥ* "wäre phonetisch unbequem," which is perfectly true but doesn't account for the form. There are several different analyses of it in the lit. Wack (AiG II.1.52 [also 274], flg. Johannson 1897) assumes that it represents **urvî̄+ūti-* with the fem. form of the adj. *urú-* as 1ˢᵗ member compounded with a fem. 2ⁿᵈ member. He does not mention that the form has to be metrically distracted, much less that the distracted vowel must be read short. Of course, the prevocalic outcome of *-ī* (<*iH*) would likely be *-ĭ(y)* as here. But the real problem is that there seem to be no other good Vedic examples of the type of cmpd envisioned, with a derived fem. adj. stem as first member showing gender agreement with the 2ⁿᵈ; the cmpds *uru-kṣití-* and *urú-gavyūti-* with the stem form of the adj. as 1ˢᵗ member even when cmpded with a fem. *-ti*-stem, provide counterexamples. (Wack could argue that the fem. was used in our case for metrical convenience; but without a grammatical model for this kind of compounding, it seems difficult to imagine a Vedic poet inventing this type even to rescue his cadence.) By contrast Lanman (Noun Inflection, pp. 380–81, esp. 381 B.4c) suggests that the first member represents the older fem. instr. in *-ī*, shortened to *-i*. (Actually he thinks *-ī* is a "contracted" form of *-iā*, but that aspect of his view is not relevant here.) Although there is more precedent for the instr. sg. than for a fem. stem-form as first cmpd. member, at least with archaic personal pronominal stems (type *yuṣmā-datta-* 'given by you'), the problem here is that there is no functional reason to have an instr.: the cmpd. must mean 'having broad/wide-ranging help', not 'having help with a broad [fem.] X'. Lanman's solution is found, in a slightly different package, in BR and is reproduced by Gr (though dismissed by Wack). The BR lemma contains the lapidary "*urviyā + ūti*," expanded a bit by Gr to "*urvî̄ = urviyă*, I. f. von *urú*." Although I think the purport of these formulations is the same as Lanman's, the invocation of *urviyă* allows us to pursue a different path: to take *urvi-* as truncated from the adverbial *urviyă*, orig. of course the long instr. of fem. *urvî̄-* but only used as an adverb. Although the fem. instr. is still the ultimate source, it would be possible for the poet to perceive *urvi-* in *urviyă* as a base form to which the instr./adverbial ending had been affixed and therefore available for compounding. I would also tentatively put forth yet a different, though related, analysis: that *urví-* preserves in altered form the old Caland compound-forming *-i-*. The derived *u*-adj. *urú-* should substitute this *-i-* when compounded, yielding **ur-i-* (of the type *r̥ji-* 'silvery', Aves. *bərəzi-* 'lofty'). This **ur-i-* of course never appears, but I would suggest that *urví-* may indirectly contain it, grafted onto the adj. stem *urú-*, encouraged by the independent adv. *urviyă*.

The phrase *śáṃso narā̃m* is a reordered variant of *narā̃m (ná) śáṃsa-*, on which see comm. ad II.34.6. Here I interpr. it as I do the similar phrase *śáṃsam āyóḥ* (IV.6.11, V.3.4)

"Laud of Āyu," as referring to the god as a sort of embodiment of the praise he receives. As I point out in the comm. ad IV.6.11, it is rather like referring to someone as "the toast of the town" or perhaps "the talk of the town" -- both of which English expressions are quite peculiar when considered literally.

On *dāti* as a root aor. subj., see comm. ad IV.8.3. Here it would be better rendered 'he will give'.

VI.24.3: The 'help' (*ūtí-*) found in the first two vss. (*ákṣitotiḥ* 1d, *urvyŭtiḥ* 2b) recurs here uncompounded. The forms of help "have grown outward" (*vy ūtáyo ruruhuḥ*) in d, an image that expands on *urvyŭtiḥ* 'having broad help' in 2b.

Despite Old's detailed disc. of the first hemistich, in which he takes *bṛhán* with *ákṣaḥ* as "the lofty axle," I am persuaded instead by Ge's interpr. Citing the nearby passage VI.21.2 … *áti mahnā́* … *riricé mahitvám*, where Indra's greatness (nom. *mahitvám*) projects beyond the two worlds in/with their greatness (instr. *mahnā́*), he supplies synonymous nom. *mahimā́* here as well, referring to Indra's greatness, with instr. *mahnā́* belonging to the two worlds as in VI.21.2. Although *te* is adjacent to *mahnā́*, it has been independently positioned by Wackernagel's Law and need not limit the following instr. Ge presumably chose to supply *mahimā́* rather than the *mahitvám* in VI.21.2 because we need a masc. here, given masc. *bṛhán*, but it also works better because *mahnā́* also belongs to this *-mán*-stem.

VI.24.4: The vs. begins and ends with pādas containing triple etymological figures: a: **śácī**vatas te puru**śā́ka śā́k**āḥ and d: **dā́man**vanto a**dāmā́**naḥ su**dā́man**. The effect seems clumsily heavy, but it is quite possible that I'm missing something. At least in the 2nd case, *sudāman* is a pun uniting two roots √ *dā* 'bind' and 'give'. It is possible that there is a buried pun also in pāda a. The previous vs. compared Indra's aid to the branches of a tree (*vṛkṣásya* … *vayā́ḥ*); another word for 'branch' is *śākhā-*, which is phonologically close to the *śāk*-forms. Perhaps the poet is punning off this unexpressed synonym.

Old is insistent that *srutí-* should be read **sṛtí-* here and in most other instances in the RV (see his comm. ad I.42.3). I don't understand his reasons and stick with the transmitted reading.

The imagery in pāda b is complex. In its other occurrence (I.56.2=IV.55.6) *saṃcáraṇa-* is used of the converging of rivers into the sea. Here the word *srutáyaḥ* 'streams' maintains the flowing imagery (another reason to keep the reading, *pace* Old [see immed. above]; see also 6a), but they are streams of cows, not of water, and this phrase ("converging like streams of cattle") is a simile, where the comparandum is Indra's abilities. But in what way do Indra's abilities flow? On what are they converging? Indra himself? or, more likely, the lucky mortal recipients of his aid?

The simile in the 2nd hemistich, "like cords for calves," likewise applying to Indra's abilities, is also opaque. Ge cites the dharmasūtra cmpd *vatsa-tantī-* (ĀpDS I.31.13, GDS IX.52), but though apposite, it is not helpful. The passages in question simply state that a snātaka should not step over a *vatsa-tantī*. Without knowing more about the details of Vedic animal husbandry, we cannot get too far, but I assume -- based on "binding without bonds" -- that calves were kept under control with very gentle ropes or perhaps by means other than tying. But why should these gentle measures be compared to Indra's abilities?

VI.24.5: The publ. tr. of this vs. differs in a number of respects from the standard interpr. In particular, in the first hemistich, flg. an interpr. of JPB's, the two pairs *anyád adyá kárvaraṃ anyád u sváḥ* "one deed today and another tomorrow" and *ásac ca sát* "non-existent and existent" are taken as a chiastic square, with *anyád adyá* matching *sát* and *anyád u sváḥ* matching *ásat*. In other words the deed Indra does today is existent, while the one he will do tomorrow is (as yet) non-existent. The standard interpr. takes *ásat ca sát* as an expression of process: Indra makes each deed (the one today, the one tomorrow) that was as yet non-existent into an existent one (so Ge "... macht Indra das Unwirkliche alsbald wirklich"). This does seem a possible interpr., and I would suggest an alternative tr. "One deed today and another tomorrow -- Indra makes the not (yet) existent (deed) existent."   Klein (DGRV I.170, II.24) takes *ásac ca sát* as "the bad and the good," which deviates from the usual sense esp. of the former and breaks the thematic connection with the first pāda: "(Performing) one deed today and another tomorrow, Indra turns hither immediately the bad and the good."

     In the 2nd hemistich the standard interpr. takes Mitra, Varuṇa, and Pūṣan as the individualized seriatim singular subjects of *paryetãsti* (=*paryetã asti*), as in Ge's "Mitra und Varuṇa und Pūṣan kommen uns dabei dem Wunsche des Nebenbuhlers zuvor." (Tichy [-tar-stems, 188] follows Ge's syntactic template, but with an aberrant interpr. of *pári √i*.) As Ge's blithe disregard of the sg. verb shows, the triple subject is somewhat awkward given sg. *asti* (though singular verbs with a series of singular subjects are indeed found). But there are several other problematic aspects to this strain of interpr. On the syntactic level, it is surprising to find *asti* in a main clause if its function is simply copular ("M, V, and P is/are *parietã*"); *asti* in main clauses is almost always existential. On the thematic level, these other gods are intrusive in the hymn -- the focus so far has been entirely on Indra -- and it seems odd suddenly to credit these gods with the power to effect a desirable thing for us, when Indra has been performing the heavy lifting all along. I therefore think that Thieme (Fremdling, 53) is correct in taking Indra as the unexpressed subject of *parietã asti*, though he doesn't discuss the passage or, rather disingenuously, even quote the preceding pāda with the other possible subjects. Given these factors, I think that *asti* is implicitly contrastive and emphatic: the other gods are there for us in some sense, but *it's Indra* who … As for the sense of *paryetã* and *pári √i* in general, the literal meaning is 'go around', hence 'encompass' and hence to contain and control, a sense that works very well here.

VI.24.6: The simile in pāda a makes explicit the flowing water implicit in 4b (see disc. above). But it is not clear what the waters are being compared to. Old suggests Schätze and Segnungen, with various rather vague parallels suggested. I find Ge's citation of nearby VI.34.1 more to the point. Pāda b of that vs. reads *ví ca tvád yanti vibhvò manīṣãḥ* "Out from you go inspired thoughts far and wide." Although Indra is generally viewed as the goal and recipient of poetic thoughts and praises, he is also, as Ge says in his n. 6ab to our passage, "der Aufgangspunkt der Dichtkunst und des Kultus." Here we can supply as subject and comparandum the 'inspired thoughts' (*manīṣãḥ*) of 34.1 or some similar reference to poetic production. The more conventional view of Indra as poetic goal is expressed in the 2nd hemistich, which roughly corresponds to VI.34.1a *sáṃ ca tvé jagmúr gíra indra pūrvíḥ* "Many songs have converged on you, Indra."

The verb (*ví*) … *anayanta* is a bit troubling because even the rare medial forms of the overwhelmingly active pres. *náya(ti)* are otherwise transitive. Cf., e.g., V.45.10 *udnā́ ná nā́vam anayanta dhī́rāḥ* "Like a boat through the water the wise ones guided (him)." I see no choice but to assume that this form has acquired a nonce intrans. sense because of its middle voice.

VI.24.7: The distribution of the three measures of time vis-à-vis the two verbs *járanti* and *avakarśáyanti* cannot be determined for certain, nor does it really matter. The pāda boundary favors keeping *mā́śāḥ* with *śarádaḥ* ("whom neither the autumns nor the months age, nor the days make lean"), but the position of the various *ná*-s might favor bracketing *mā́sāḥ* with *dyā́vaḥ*. This is how Ge tr., and I have followed suit, though I don't feel strongly one way or the other.

VI.24.8: *stavā́n* is an intractable form, found also in II.19.5, 20.5. In all three cases it is found in this same, apparently nom. sg., form, referring to Indra, and with the likely value 'being praised, having/receiving praise'. In all three cases it also occurs at the end of a Triṣṭubh pāda, which suggests that the root syllable should be heavy (**stāvā́n*) -- though Old (ad II.19.5) does not regard this as a problem. Old discusses the form in great detail ad II.19.5 without reaching a firm conclusion; see also KEWA III.521, with listing of the lit. but again no conclusions. Assuming that the form belongs to √*stu* 'praise' (other proposed root affiliations are properly dismissed by Old), there are two main strains of explanation: as a truncation or as a haplology. Several different underlying forms have been suggested for the truncation; the least problematic is Pischel's suggested pres. mid. part. *stavānáḥ* (1x; versus fairly common *stávāna*-). But least problematic doesn't mean *un*problematic: lopping off inflectional endings isn't a practice we find elsewhere in the RV, esp. when it leaves an unanalysable form, and we might expect the accent to follow that of the common root-accented participle. The haplology explanation (owing ultimately to Johansson, who was responsible for one of the explanations of *urvyū́tiḥ* above, vs. 2) has found more general acceptance (see AiG I.Nachtr. 161, though cf. Mayrhofer's lack of enthusiasm in KEWA, cited above) -- that it is derived from a -*vant*-stem, nom. sg. **stava-vā́n*, with haplologic loss of the medial syllable. Old raises several objections to this: first, that the accent is wrong. The accent of -*vant*-stems is overwhelmingly that of the base noun; if the putative stem was formed to *stáva*- 'praise', it should have yielded **stá(va)vān*. Old's 2nd objection has to do with this base form: that *stáva*- is found only once in the RV. I tentatively advance a different explanation from either of the prevailing ones, that it is formed with a Hoffmann suffix (**-Hon-/ -Hn-*), to the just mentioned *stáva*- 'praise', hence 'having praise'. This would produce the attested long vowel; moreover, insofar as we can tell, the Hoffmann suffix attracts the accent. See *somān*- 'having soma' (based on root-accented *sóma*-) and discussion ad I.18.1. Of course, the rarity of the base form *stáva*- is a problem here, as it was for the -*vant*-stem explanation just presented, but perhaps because the Hoffmann suffix was not synchronically productive and therefore our *stavā́n* should be an old form, this rarity is less problematic than for the productive -*vant*-stems. It might also be possible to posit a long-vowel base **stāva*- (cf. fem. *stāvā́*- VS XVIII.42), with expected Brugmann's Law outcome for a standard **o*-grade thematic noun, producing **stāvā́n*. Though, once the

formation of *stāván* was no longer understood, this vṛddhi would have been eliminated in the transmitted text in favor of the guṇa prevailing in the verbal forms, it would still be reflected in the heavy syllable called for by the cadential pattern.

VI.24.9: In a the instr. *ámatreṇa* can be supplied with the instr. adj.s, extracted from the possessive *amatrin* 'having an *ámatra-*'.

In b *sutapāvan* reprises *sutapā(ḥ)* in 1b.

vyùṣṭau (/-iṣu) almost always occurs with dependent *uṣásaḥ* -- "at the early brightening of the dawn" -- and of course is derived from the same root √*vas* 'dawn' as *uṣás-*. Here we find the apparent opposite: *aktór vyùṣṭau* "at the early brightening of the night"; despite the anonymity of the genitives, I think the two expressions refer to the same time period, the moment when the deep darkness of night begins to lift. This can be considered as brightening either of the night or of the dawn. On the almost identical expression in V.30.13 and its morphological twist, see comm. ad loc.

VI.25 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn has an omphalos shape, with vs. 5 the omphalos, surrounded by matched vss. 4 and 6. Although vss. 3 and 7 do not show similar matchings, there is some repeated phraseology between vss. 1/2 and 8/9: *vṛtrahátye* 1c, 8b; *spṛ́dhaḥ (...) mithatī́ḥ* 2a, 9ab.

VI.25.1–2: On *avīḥ* (1c) and *áva tārīḥ* (2d) as "hortativ," see Hoffmann Injunk. 264.

VI.25.1: That *avīḥ* of c is also the verb of d is suggested by passages like I.110.9 *vā́jebhir no vā́jasātau aviḍḍhi*, VIII.46.11 *dhíyo vā́jebhir āvitha* with √*av* and an instr. of *vā́ja-* 'prize'.

VI.25.2: Ge supplies the verb 'drive' in c ("Mit diesen (treib) alle Angriffe auseinander"), but I see no reason why it can't be in the orbit of d. In vs. 1 the two pādas cd share a single verb (*avīḥ* c), as do the first two pādas of this vs. (*vyathayā*). With this pattern established, it seems reasonable to take *áva tārīḥ* in d as also governing the accusatives of c. Under this interpr., I take *víṣūcīḥ* as proleptic, rather like 3d *kṛṇuhī́ párācaḥ* "put them far away."

VI.25.3: Pāda c lacks a verb to govern the acc. *vithurā́ śávāṃsi*. On the model of 1cd, 2ab, and 2cd, we might simply deploy the (first) verb of d, *jahí*, across the pāda boundary: "smash their faltering powers" or, with proleptic adj., "smash their powers (to be) faltering." However, *vithurā́* is derived from the root √*vyath* 'falter', whose causative supplied the verb in 2ab, *vyathayā*. I therefore think there's a different kind of trick here: the poet expects us to supply the CAUSATIVE feature of the verb in 2b with the lexical feature of that verb contained in the adj. *vithurā́* -- hence my tr. "(render) their powers faltering."

VI.25.4: *tanūrúc-* is, of course, a root noun cmpd., 'shining with/in their bodies', but the bahuvrīhi-like tr. works better in context.

kṛṇvaíte is clearly meant as a 3rd du. mid. subjunctive to the 5th cl. pres. of √*kṛ*, but it has the wrong grade of the suffix: we expect **kṛṇávaite* (cf. 2nd du. mid. *aśnávaithe*

[VII.70.4]). It clearly simply anticipates the root pres. 3rd du. mid. *brávaite*, which ends the next hemistich (4d). This imitation comes at a metrical cost: the heavy root syllable *kṛṇv* produces a bad Triṣṭubh cadence. (The grammatically correct form would also, of course, be metrically problematic.) A root aor. subj. **karaite* would fit the meter better, but there's no warrant for emendation. For a passage in which the poet simply avoids the middle dual subjunctive of √*kṛ* altogether by substituting a plural, see comm. ad I.178.2.

The locative string in cd is the usual expression of the stakes -- a type of loc. absol. lacking an overt participle. The full expression is *dháne hité* "when the stake is set" (VI.45.11, 13, etc.). The string here contains a formulatic pair, *toké … tánaye* "progeny and prosperity" with three other locc., one inserted inside the formula. On the basis of VI.31.1 (q.v.), where a *ca* after *tánaye* better delineates the pairing, I would slightly change the tr. to "when progeny and prosperity [or, offspring and lineage], cattle, water, and fields are at stake."

The two *vā*-s (4a, 4c), in conjunction with the subjunctives, seem to set out a deliberative choice: "it may be that X … or it may be that Y." The two possibilities floated as to how one champion might defeat another set the stage for the next vs. (5), which forecloses any possibility that one of the champions, even a successful one, could take on Indra. The two *vā*-s are slightly off-balance, however, since the first one is located in the main clause (a) to which the first *yád* clause is immediately appended (b), while the second is found in the second *yád* clause, whose main clause seems to be, by default, the original pāda a. This seems to me a minor problem: the point is that the two champions (*śū́ra-*) in pāda a may defeat each other in single combat (b) *or* in a full-on battle (cd). The first *vā* would be better positioned in pāda b, but it has been shifted to the front of the whole main-cl./dep.-cl. construction -- a sort of super-Wackernagel's Law position. Klein (DGRV II.194, 201) treats the two *vā* occurrences separately, taking the 2nd as conjoining (or disjoining) the parallel *yád* clauses b and c, but the 1st as the equivalent of "the asserverative particle *vaí*." This seems somewhat perverse to me: two occurrences of the same particle in a single verse, esp. a particle that regularly appears in pairs, invite a unified explanation; moreover, I am very dubious that *vā* is ever used for *vaí*, a particle that is rare in the RV anyway. Even Klein can only identify 6 passages where he thinks *vā* = *vaí* (DGRV II.201), of which he finds syntactic support for only 3. That 6c contains a pair of *vā*-s whose syntactic connection is clearer provides evidence that these two *vā*-s also form a pair.

VI.25.6–8: Each of these vss. contains at least one derivative of *nṛ́-* '(superior) man': 6a *nṛmṇám*, 6c *nṛváti*, 7c *nṛ́tamāsaḥ*, 8d *nṛṣáhye*.

VI.25.6: By my analysis this vs. matches 4 in structure and in referents, forming with 4 a ring around the omphalos vs. 5. In the first pāda the unspecified pair (*ubháyoḥ … ayóḥ* "of both of these") refers, in my view (as also, apparently, Ge), to the two *krándasī* (lit. 'war-cries', viz., opposing forces) of 4d; Indra has mastery over the manly power of both of them, as vs. 5 has already implied. The verb of 6b, *hávante*, doubles *brávaite* in 4d semantically; both refer to verbal appeals to Indra for help in battle. The two forces referred to in an oblique case in pāda a return as subject in pāda d, with yet another 3rd du. med. subjunctive, *vitantasaíte*.

Pace Ge, who gives them different roles, the locc. in c are parallel and match those of 4c, expressing what is at stake in the battle. Alhough it might seem odd to name a *vṛtrá-* as a stake, I think the point is that the battle may be about confronting an obstacle or about acquiring a rich dwelling place. Klein's tr. (DGRV II.159) "when they battle each other in the (struggle with the) obstacle or in (the struggle for) great dwelling space rich in heroes" reflects the same view. See Schaeffer (Intens. 126–27) for detailed disc. A similar use of *vṛtréṣu* is found in the next hymn (VI.26.2), where it is implicitly parallel to *góṣu*, an expression for the stakes.

I take the subordinator *yádī* in b as representing *yád* + *ī* ('when' + acc. particle) (as described pp. 305–9 in my 2002 article "Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm*), rather than conditional *yádi* 'if'. All that needs to be done is to insert a notional word space between *yád* and *ī*. The pāda could use an overt acc. (*ī* 'him', as obj. of *hávante*), and 'if' does not make sense.

The publ. tr. implicitly reflects a similar analysis of *yádi* in d, but I now think that interpr. is probably incorrect. In favor of it is the parallelism with the matched vs. 4, which contains two parallel *yád* clauses. But several factors, both formal and functional, weigh against it: the final *i* of *yádi* is short and does not occur before a cons. cluster, which elsewhere facilitates the shortening of the particle *ī*. Moreover, an acc. referent is not necessary to the clause, since the verb is a reciprocal middle (though see I.131.3, also with med. *ví √ taṃs*, *ví tvā tatasre* "They have tussled over you," a passage that also contains a loc. of the stakes). The publ. tr. also renders the subjunctive *vitantasaíte* as an indicative. I now think that the conditional *yádi* and the subjunctive contribute to the same semantic effect. For a full revised tr. see below.

On the assumption that cd forms a single dependent clause (as it does in the publ. tr. and in Ge), the *yádi* is too deep in the clause, following not only the nom. du. adj. *vyácasvantā* that opens pāda d but also the complex loc. phrase that occupies pāda c. This problem could be easily remedied by connecting c with b, rather than with d, leaving *yádi* in standard 2nd position in a clause now consisting only of d. The only obstacle to that reassignment is my interpr. of *maháḥ*, which in the publ. tr. I take as a sentential adverb and construe with *vitantasaíte* ("… keep tussling mightily"). However, that interpr. is quite fragile, esp. because of the position of *maháḥ*, and I am happy to abandon it, though I do not have a particularly good alternative suggestion. Schaeffer (Intens. 128) first suggests that it is an adverb, with adjectival aspirations (not her phrase), construed with the following phrase *nṛváti kṣáye*, in the manner of Old's (ZDMG 55 [1901]: 270–71) interpr. of *mahó rāyé* "mächtiglich zu Reichtum" → "zu mächtigem Reichtum" -- in this instance "mächtiglich männerreiches Land" → "grosses männerreiches Land." Alternatively she suggests it could be an acc. pl. with gapped *devãn* as a goal or obj. of *vitantasaíte* ("sooft die zwei … (Völkerschaften) die Grossen (Götter) angehen …"). This second suggestion seems quite implausible, but the first one is possible, in the absence of anything better. In any event, it is essentially the interpr. given by Ge ("um einen grossen männerreichen Wohnsitz"), however he arrived at it. (Judging from his n. 6cd it rests on Sāy.'s high-handed glossing of *maho* with loc. *mahati*.) Klein's tr. "great dwelling space rich in heroes" (see above) simply follows Ge and also shows a quasi-adj. interpr. of *maháḥ*.

Putting all this together, I offer the revised translation:

"He is master of the manly power of both of these (armies) when the ritual adepts call on him in the clash,
       whether an obstacle or a dwelling place rich in men is at issue — if the two (armies) in their expansion will keep tussling mightily back and forth with one another."

VI.25.7: As usual, *aryáḥ* has a number of possible interpr. Ge takes it as nom. pl. identical to the *sūráyaḥ* in d. Old suggests either acc. pl. or abl. sg. without choosing one. Thieme (Fremdling, 73–74) opts for the abl. sg., which he construes (as does Old) with the splv. *nṛtamāsaḥ*: "… als unsere, im Vergleich zum Fremdling sehr heldenhaften Schutzherren …" But of course an ablative with a superlative would be highly unusual (though Old offers a single parallel and a ref. to Delbrück's Vgl. Syn.). I also take it as an abl., but suggest construing it with *puráḥ*. I now see that this is also problematic, since it is not clear that *puráḥ* ever takes the abl. Gr gives two exx.: but in IV.7.9 the supposed abl. is a gen. and construed elsewhere; in III.53.23 the form in question (*áśvān*) could be either an abl. sg. or an acc. pl. in sandhi. Nonetheless I hold to this interpr. Although *puráḥ* + ABL is not a robust construction, the related *purā* is regularly found with the abl. Here I would suggest that we have a sort of pun. The lexeme *puráḥ* + √ *dhā* 'set in front, install' is of course very common, and that phrase is found here, *dadhiré puró naḥ*. Although, as I just said, to express "ahead of / in front of the stranger" we might expect *aryáḥ* [abl.] … *purā*, there was interference with the VP *dadhiré puró naḥ* "they have set us in front," and *puráḥ* prevailed.

VI.25.8: The HvN ed. resolves the contraction across pāda boundary of *yajatréndra* as *yajatrā índra*. This must be a careless error, since the Pp. has *yajatra índra*, and the stem *yájatra-* has root accent.

VI.25.9: Pāda c = I.177.5c and X.89.17c. Ge (fld. by Klein, DGRV I.458) construes *vástoḥ* with *vidyāma* ("Möchten wir Sänger … den neuen Tag erleben"), but well-attested *vástoḥ* is otherwise a temporal expression 'at dawn, in the morning'. In both the other passages, the pāda in question is adjoined by a pāda that likewise begins *vidyāma* (following in I.177.5, preceding in X.89.17), and the obj. of that *vidyāma* can be assumed with the one in the repeated pāda. The d pāda of X.89.17 is almost identical to d here, with the substitution of a different poetic family: *viśvāmitrāḥ* for our *bharádvājāḥ*.
       The function and position of *utá* in d are unclear. The publ. tr. implicitly assumes that it loosely connects the 2nd hemistich with the 1st ("And with your help …"), but locating this clausal conjunction in 2nd position of the 2nd pāda of what it's conjoining would be an irrational poetic strategy. I now think it likely that it conjoins the temporal expressions *vástoḥ* and *nūnám*, and I would alter the tr. to "With your help … might we Bharadvājas know (this), as we sing at dawn and also now" (or "might we know (this) at dawn and also now, as we sing"). The curiosity then is the position of *te*, which can only belong to something in the preceding pāda: either "with your help" (as I take it in the publ. tr.) or "as we sing to you." I suppose that *utá*'s strong tendency to take 1st position makes it a natural host for enclitics even when it is not so located, but it really seems odd that it would sweep *te* up and away from the elements it should be limiting.

VI.26 Indra

On the various stylistic tics of this hymn, see publ. intro.

VI.26.1–2: As noted in the publ. intro., the 1ˢᵗ two vss. play on the word *vā́ja-*, presumably as a reference to the Bharadvāja bardic line: 1b, 2b *mahó vā́jasya*, 2a *vājī́ … vājineyáḥ*.

VI.26.1: On *vāvṛṣāṇā́ḥ*, see comm. ad VIII.61.7 on *úd vāvṛṣasva*.

VI.26.2: The hapax *vājineyáḥ* is somewhat surprising, because the *-eyá*-suffix generally builds metronymics (AiG II.2.505–11), and so it should mean 'son of a female prize-winner / of a prize-winning mare' -- a feminine connection that would be particularly surprising if it's meant as a reference to the Bharadvāja family. Although I don't have a good explanation, I do think the intrusion of this marked suffix, fairly rare in the RV, should be taken serious, and if *vājineyá-* is derived from the *vājínī-* (found in *vājínī-vant-* and *vājínī-vasu-*) (cf. AiG II.2.507 for this possibility), this provides another support for my contention that *vājínī-* has real fem. reference, and its *-ī-* is not simply an Erweiterung (*pace* Debrunner, AiG II.2.409). See disc. ad I.48.6.

Since pāda c lacks a main verb, it could belong either with ab or with d. Ge takes it with ab, seeming to refer to VI.46.1 as a parallel, and the publ. tr. follows suit. On the basis of VI.25.6c with contrastive locatives of the stake, one of which is *vṛtré* (see comm. immed. above), I am now inclined to reassign it to d, with *vṛtréṣu* (c) and *góṣu* (d) the stakes. The revised tr. would be "… secured; to you … when obstacles (are at stake), to you when cows (are at stake) does the fistfighter look as he fights."

VI.26.3–6: These vss. are tr. and discussed by Hoffman (*Injunk.*, 183–84).

VI.26.3: As discussed ad VI.20.4, the three occurrences of *arká-sāti-* 'the winning of the sun's rays' (I.174.7, VI.20.4, and here) are all found in conjunction with a poet (*kaví-*) and in connection with the Kutsa / Śuṣṇa myth. These associations point fairly decisively to Uśanā Kāvya as the poet in question.

Pāda b contains one of the few occurrences of √ *vṛj* 'twist, wring' without preverb; another is found nearby at VI.18.8.

Hoffmann (183) reads injunc. *párā han* for Pp. *párā ahan*. Given the preponderance of injunctives in these vss. and esp. *han* at the end of 5c, this seems likely. (See also *sácāhan* in the next vs. and 6d.)

VI.26.4: As in 3c, Hoffmann (184) reads *sácā han* in c rather than Pp. *sácā ahan*, which seems perfectly plausible. As for the unequivocal imperfect *ā́vaḥ* in b, he suggests that this may not have been the original form, citing the almost identical I.33.14b *prā́vo yúdhyantaṃ vṛṣabháṃ dáśadyum*. If the original reading was **prā́vaḥ*, it could contain the injunctive: *prá avaḥ*. However, it is unclear to me how the corruption would have arisen, particularly because in the next vs. (5) the d pāda begins *prā́vaḥ*. Moreover the pāda preceding I.33.14b begins with *ā́vaḥ*, a clear imperfect matching the one here. Hoffmann's other observation -- that this pres. stem has no clear injunctive forms (and only one possible one, *ávaḥ* in

I.121.12, which more likely belongs to the *s*-stem noun; see comm. ad loc.) -- seems more apposite. For whatever reason the injunctive to this stem was avoided -- or, perhaps better phrased, *āva-* was treated as the injunctive stem.

I do not entirely understand what *sácā* is doing here; it seems to add little and have no obvious syntactic connection to the rest. As discussed ad IV.31.5, *sácā* with loc. is regularly a pleonastic marker of the loc. abs., but there is no loc. here. Gr cites our passage here as an ex. of *sácā* after a dat. meaning "zu seinen Gunsten," but I don't understand how this meaning would have developed from 'together with'. The same sequence (*sácā han*) is found two vss. later (6d) in the same general context: Indra's smiting of an enemy on behalf of a mortal friend, and I.63.3 *tvám śúṣṇam … kútsāya dyumáte sácā han* shows the same configuration. In all three passages I tr. it 'in partnership' as an adverbial. Perhaps *sácā* signals an esp. close relationship between Indra and his mortal beneficiary. The voc. epithet of Indra in 7c, hapax *sadhavīra* 'you who have our heroes as companions' in my tr., might support this view, and see also 8ab. I am not entirely persuaded by my own interpr., however.

On *tūtos, tūtot* as belonging to a redup. aor., not the perfect (contra Wh Rts, Macd. VGS), see detailed disc. by Kü (220–21); Hoffmann also identifies it as an aor. (183); Gr already took it as a caus. aor., and see also Schaeffer (Intens. 129–30).

VI.26.5: For the association of *barháṇā* and *ukthá-* see VI.44.6 *ukthásya barháṇā*.

Pāda b contains one of the few exx. of the "-*si* imperative" that betrays its non-imperatival source, since *dárṣi* occurs in a subord. cl., from which imperatives are barred. Here it shows its original subjunctive value in a purpose cl. (so also Hoffmann, 183).

Initial *áva* in c breaks the long pattern of 2nd sg. pronouns beginning the hemistich (vss. 2–5a, resumed vss. 6, 7c, with such forms also beginning even pādas 2d, 4d, 7b). Perhaps it is meant to resonante with 4b #*ắvo*, 5d #*prắvo*.

VI.26.6: As I have discussed elsewhere (Sacrificed Wife, 176–84), *śraddhắ-* in Vedic is not simply an abstract 'trust, faith', but refers specifically to trust in the efficacy of ritual and hospitality, and indeed to the concrete manifestations of this trust through ritual gift-giving. The plural *śraddhắbhiḥ* here, paired with *sómaiḥ*, seems to refer to the offerings themselves.

On *sácā* see comm. ad vs. 4.

Pāda d contains a fine sequence of alliterative sibilants of all three types: *ṣaṣṭíṃ sahasrā śácyā sácā han*.

VI.26.7: Ge takes *tváyā* as the agent with *stávante*: "dass die Helden … von dir gelobt werden." But Indra as the *praiser* of mortals seems off; *tváyā* is better taken as an instr. of accompaniment, esp. given the larger context of the hymn, in which Indra works for and in conjunction with mortals (see esp. disc. ad vs. 4 with regard to *sácā*). The hapax cmpd *sadhavīra* applied to Indra seems to reflect this situation, though exactly what the word means is unclear (Gr 'mit den Männern seiend', Ge 'Heldengenosse'), and its lack of accent makes it difficult to determine even what type of cmpd it is. (AiG has no disc. of it.) I take it as an underlying bahuvrīhi 'having heroes together (with oneself)' vel sim., expressing the mutual relationship between our men and Indra.

Ge takes the instr. phrase *trivárūthena náhuṣā* as referring to Indra: "da du ein dreifacher Nahus bist." He bases this interpr. on X.49.8 *ahám … náhuṣo náhuṣtaraḥ* "I [=Indra] am a greater Nahus than Nahus." But this passage is in an ātmastuti, a genre in which Indra claims to be the best example of everything, and the construction with comparative in fact *precludes* an identification of Indra with Nahus: he is asserting that he has more of what makes Nahus Nahus than Nahus himself does. It is an expression like "more Catholic than the Pope." (As for X.99.7, which Ge also cites, I have now changed my interpr. from the publ. tr. and will register the change in the comm. in due course.) I consider Nahus here another recipient of the praise being doled out, though I do have to admit that the shadowy Nahus otherwise does not figure in the VIth Maṇḍala.

I would also take issue with Ge's bleaching of *trivárūtha-* from 'having/providing threefold defense' to simply 'threefold'. This cmpd. otherwise has its full lexical value, mostly modifying *śárman-* 'shelter', and the simplex *várūtha-* 'defense' is robustly attested, so the 2nd cmpd member had not become opaque.

VI.26.8: This final wish to become Indra's dearest companions neatly sums up the dominant theme of the hymn, esp. the last vss.

VI.27 Indra

VI.27.1–2: These two vss. form a tight pair, whose responses are detailed below.

VI.27.1: This vs. is structured by the extreme repetition of *kím*, found 5 times in interlocking sets. In the 1st hemistich 3 occur in the phrase *kím (u) asya* LOC. The 1st 2 are initial in the 1st pāda and immediately after the caesura, while the third one, rather than opening the 2nd pāda, gives the impression of syncopation by being placed after pāda-initial *índraḥ*. The third pāda has the sequence in scrambled order: … LOC *kím (té) asya*, with the tonic prn. *té* incongruously inserted. The last *kím u*, in pāda d, lacks both *asya* and the LOC, but clearly is conjoined with *kím* in pāda c with the rest of the phrase construction truncated.

There are many possible ways to interpr. this construction. The first question is whether *kím* is a question particle or a neut. interrogative prn. (see, e.g., Etter, *Fragesätze*, 75, 124–25), or indeed if some of the occurrences are one, some the other. I am firmly of the opinion that, simply on rhetorical grounds, the number of repetitions favors a referential prn. for all, rather than a particle. Moreover, vs. 2 offers a concrete answer to the question "what?" — namely *sát* 'being, what exists' — in the same number and in the same positions as *kím* in vs. 1. The response could hardly be more complete. Another question is whether pāda a should be read independently, as containing two parallel nominal clauses, with the hemistich-final verb only having domain over pāda b, or whether the verb should be read with the whole hemistich. Because of the parallelism of the *kím (u) asya* phrases I opt for the latter solution, as does Ge.

Another curiosity is the fact that *asya* is unaccented in all its occurrences. Unaccented forms of this pronoun should be anaphoric, with a referent preceding in the discourse, but of course in the 1st vs. of the hymn there is no preceding discourse. However, the first two locatives, in pāda a, establish without doubt the identity of the referent -- soma:

"in the exhilaration (*máde*) of it" and "in the drinking (*pītaú*) of it" could refer to nothing else in the universe of RVic discourse. See the numerous examples of *máde sómasya* (generally in that order) in Lub, beginning with I.46.12; the loc. of *pītí-* is almost confined to our passage, but the dat. phrase *sómasya pītáye* is almost inescapable (see again Lub). The 2nd set of locatives, *sakhyé* 'in the fellowship' and *niṣádi* 'in the installation' are less clearly typed for soma -- and in fact the latter might sidetrack us to Agni and his ritual installation -- but by that time the soma context has been unequivocally established. The unusual application of *ní √ sad* to soma simply shows the frequent secondary fusion of the two principal ritual divinities/substances.

The first hemistich is otherwise unproblematic, but the second one raises some further questions. The first word, *ráṇā*, is taken by the Pp as nom. pl. *ráṇāḥ* in pausa, an interpr. followed by the standard treatments. By this interpr. these "joys" are the subj. of *vividre* in the main cl. Both act. and mid. forms of this pf. are normally transitive, and so the question should be "what did the previous joys find, what the new ones?" See Ge's "Oder was seine guten Launen bei der (Opfer)sitzung sind, was haben die … erreicht?" But this does not make a lot of sense to me: in what way are "joy" agents here? Old seems to get out of this semantic problem by taking the verb as a sort of pass./intrans. with gen. *asya* as the experiencer (presumably referring to Indra) and *kím* as a predicate nominative: "oder die Freuden, die bei (seinem, des Soma) Sichniederlassen ..., als was sind diese ihm eignen … erfahren?" But besides forcing an unnatural sense on the verb, it assumes a different referent for *asya* in c from the referents of the 3 occurrences in ab (as does Ge's). My own interpr. is based on a different analysis of *ráṇā* — as the instr. sg. of the root noun *rán-*, attested as dat. sg. *ráṇe*, loc. sg. *rán*, and indeed (*pace* Gr) as this same instr. sg. in IX.7.7 (see Old ZDMG 63 [1909]: 289 = KlSch 305). (Note that with the elim. of the supposed nom. pl. in our passage, the stem *ráṇa-* is entirely singular, save for a single late loc. pl. *ráṇeṣu* [X.120.5], quite possibly confected to produce a Triṣṭubh cadence from sg. *ráṇe*.)

With *ráṇā* otherwise interpr., the subj. of *vividre* is open. I supply "priests" (or a similar group of mortal devotees of Indra); cf. *nūtanāsaḥ* in similar usage in nearby VI.21.5 and the similarly contrastive expression *pūrvebhir ṛṣibhiḥ … nūtanair utá* in I.1.2. One problem remains, however. By my interpr. *asya* in c has the same referent as the other 3 exx. in ab, and like them it is construed with a loc., here *niṣádi*: the insistent repetitive pattern of the vs. imposes this reading. But *asya* is stationed in the main clause, as marked by the immediately preceding *té*, correlative with *yé* in the nominal relative cl. (cf. the whole pāda *ráṇā vā yé niṣádi kíṃ té asya*), though it should precede *kíṃ té*. (Ge's rendering cited above also has this problem, though he construes *asya* with *ráṇā(ḥ)*, not *niṣádi*.) I can only explain this by assuming that acdg. to the pattern established in ab, *kím (x) asya* LOC, *kím* here has carried the pronoun *asya* along with it into the main cl., even though the constituency is in all cases *asya* LOC.

VI.27.4–5: Hoffmann (Injunk. 163–64) tr. and discusses this pair of vss., with special reference to the change from augmented to injunctive verbs.

VI.27.5: Abhyāvartin Cāyamāna is the subj. of the dānastuti in vs. 8.

VI.27.6: On the warriors' slang in this vs. and the curiously literal attempts at interpreting *pắtrā bhindānắḥ*, see publ. intro. and Old ad loc., Ge n. 6d.

VI.27.7: The purport of this vs. and the referent of *yásya* in pāda are disputed. As Ge points out (n. 7), Sāy. thinks ab refers to Indra and his two fallow bays, while Ge thinks *yásya* refers to Śṛñjaya found in c and marks the beginning of the dānastuti. I agree with Sāy. that Indra is the referent of *yásya*, but not that the two cows are really his two horses. As noted in the publ. intro., I instead assume *gávau* refers to the two rivers found in vss. 5 (Hariyūpīyā) and 6 (Yavyāvatī). A strikingly similar expression refers unequivocally to two rivers in the famous hymn III.33 (Viśvāmitra and the Rivers): III.33.1 *gáveva śubhré mātárā rihāṇé* "licking each other like two mother cows (their calves)" (cf. also III.33.3). The only problem is that though, in this gender-variable stem, du. *gávau* can be either masc. or fem. (for the latter, see *gávā* in III.33.1 just cited), one of the du. adjectives in our passage, *aruṣắ*, should be masc., since the fem. of this stem is *áruṣī*, which in fact appears with pl. *gó-* in I.92.1-2: *gávó 'ruṣīḥ, áruṣīr gāḥ*. I can only assume that since the rest of this dual NP (*gávau … sūyavasyū … rérihāṇā*) could be either masc. or fem., *aruṣắ* was just slotted in, esp. because it looks like a possible fem. du.
   The verb *antár … cárataḥ* is somewhat difficult to interpr. This lexeme generally refers to a journey between two locations -- often of Agni's journey as messenger between heaven and earth. Here no locations are specified, and, assuming the correctness of my identification of the dual subject as the rivers of vss. 5–6 (not a certain assumption), it is two rivers that must be performing the action. Perhaps the verb is reciprocal, expressing action between the two subjects: "(the two rivers) go back and forth one to the other," but this would leave *yásya* without an obvious role in the clause. Instead I take *yásya* as the beneficiary of the action (an honorary dative) and assume the rivers are acting as go-between for Indra, either between his forces and the enemy's or between the two divisions of the Vṛcīvant forces referred to in 5d.

VI.28 Cows and Indra

VI.28.1: In pāda a 'house' is supplied as obj. of *bhadrám akran* on the basis of 6c *bhadráṃ gṛháṃ kṛṇutha*. Ge simply "haben Glück gebracht," Whitney (AV IV.21.1) "have done what is excellent," and this is certainly possible.

VI.28.2: What precise kind of land *ábhinne khilyé* refers to is unclear; see disc. by Old and Ge n. 2d. The general opinion is that *ábhinne* ('uncut, unsplit') describes land that hasn't been broken into parcels, but I wonder if it instead means 'unploughed' -- that is, unsplit by a plough.

VI.28.3: I do not understand what nuance the vṛddhi of *ắmitrá-* adds to *amítra-*. Both seem simply to mean 'enemy, foe'.
   Ge takes *vyáthiḥ* as a "falsch Weg" upon which the enemy will lead the cows, requiring him to supply a complex verb phrase to √*dhṛṣ*, "wagen … den falschen Weg (zu führen)" (see also his n. 3b for an even more complex alternative). But *vyáthis-* 'wavering

or meandering course' fits the normal aimless wandering of cows in pasture, and surely we wish to prevent cattle rustlers (or the like) from taking advantage of the cows' wandering. Cf. Whitney, AV IV.21.3 "shall dare attack their track (?)"; Klein (DGRV I.219) "a hostile one shall not venture upon their way." For the wandering habits of cows, see 4cd *urugāyám … ví caranti* "They wander far across wide-ranging (space)."

Given the acc., it seems best, with Ge et al., to take *devā́n* only with *yájate*, not, as in the publ. tr., also with *dádāti*. I therefore would emend the tr. to "With those (cows) that he sacrifices to the gods and (that) he gives …" The expression is compressed: the instr. *yā́bhiḥ* should of course only be construed with *yájate*, and we should have an acc. *yā́ḥ* as obj. of *dádāti.* As a parallel to *devā́n*, Ge supplies a datival "(den Sänger)" with *dádāti* (sim. Klein loc. cit.), but I see no reason to limit the recipient in this way. Cf. the open-ended 2b *úpéd dadāti*, which specifies neither gift nor recipient. The unstinting giver is rewarded.

VI.28.4: On *reṇú-kakāṭa-* see EWA s.v. *kakā́ṭikā-, kŕ̥kāṭa-.* Some part of the back of the head/neck is meant. What exact threat the dusty-necked steed poses to the cows isn't exactly clear. Sāy. explains *árvā* as *yuddhārtham āgato 'śvaḥ.* I would limit the "intent to fight" more narrowly to a cattle raid, but there is no further evidence to bring to bear. See immed. below.

saṃskr̥tatrám is also somewhat problematic. It is generally referred to the root √*kr̥t* 'cut' (see AiG II.2.170 and, most recently, EWA p. 316 s.v. *KART*[1]), but this affiliation is disputed by Whitney (Roots, p. 23) and, most vigorously, by Old, who assigns it to √*kr̥* for both formal and semantic reasons. The standard rendering is 'Schlachtbank' (slaughter or, Whitney [AV, despite Rts], slaughterhouse). Against this interpr., Old makes the reasonable point that in this pre-ahiṃsā era there's no reason why a cow-owner wouldn't have his cows slaughtered when he wanted to. But Old's own solution is excessively convoluted and requires that the final *-tra-* belong to √*trā* 'protect', which seems dubious. (On *gotrá-* and other possible forms of the thematized root noun *-trā́-* in compounds, see Scarlatta [194–95].) To meet Old's objections, we can interpr. the clause in the context of the preceding clause and of the whole vs. The 2nd half of the vs. expresses a wish for the safety of cows that roam widely, presumably not always under the control and in the sight of a herdman. The first hemistich mentions several misadventures that could befall these roving cattle. Pāda a refers, if I'm right, to a cattle raid conducted by horsemen -- what in the Old West (or at least the Old West of the imagination) would be called rustlers. It may be that the "dusty neck" of the horse in question indirectly indicates that the horse is not a well-cared-for beast of the Ārya elite, or else that the raid requires hard riding in rough country. The second pāda may indicate that the cattle rustled were taken for meat or, under a different scenario, that the cows wandered into territory controled by tribals, non-Ārya, or even non-elite Ārya (all without access to horses) who would ambush, kill, and eat them. Both pādas would imply that the cattle are far from the safety of their home and enclosure.

My "place for dressing" reflects the possibility (see above) that *saṃskr̥ta-* belongs to √*kr̥* not √*kr̥t*, and is a euphemistic expression for slaughter. However, if it does belong to √*kr̥t* "… for slaughter" would be just fine.

VI.28.5: The publ. tr. follows the usual configuration of equational nominal sentences, with the subject in 2nd position, the predicate nominal 1st. This interpr. is supported by the fact that the verb *achān* is singular, agreeing with *bhágaḥ* and *índraḥ*, not with pl. *gāvaḥ* 'cows'. However, the standard tr. (Ge, Wh) follow the opposite order, e.g., Ge "Diese Kühe sind mir wie Bhaga …" In which case, we would have to assume that *achān* simply agrees with the nearer referent, even though it is the predicate.

In c the phrase *sá jánāsa índraḥ* must be a deliberate echo of the famous refrain of II.12. It also demonstrates the standard Vedic prose syntactic rule that in an expression of the type "what is X, that is Y," the demonstrative in the 2nd cl. will agree with Y, not X, in number and gender, even though its real referent is X, or in this case cows. For further disc. see Brereton's "*Tat tvam asi* in Context."

VI.28.6: This vs., like 5c, has an echo from the 2nd Maṇḍala: the final pāda *bṛhád vo váya ucyate sabhāsu* "Your vigor is declared loftily in the assemblies" strikingly resembles the Gṛtsamāda Triṣṭubh refrain *bṛhád vadema vidáthe suvīrāḥ* "May we speak loftily at the ritual distribution, in possession of good heroes." Both begin with adverbial *bṛhát* and contain a verb of speaking -- a passive in our case -- and a loc. of the place where the speech is spoken: *vidáthe* 'at the ceremony of distribution', *sabhāsu* 'in assemblies', with *sabhā-* probably inhabiting a lower register, as might be appropriate for cows.

Kulikov (*-ya*-pres., 214) denies a passive value for *ucyate* here and tr. "Your energy sounds loudly in the assemblies" for reasons that don't seem sufficient to me.

VI.28.7: Note that *sūyávasam* echoes (*gāvau …*) *sūyavasyū* in the preceding hymn (VI.27.7).

On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

VI.28.8: The usual tr. of this vs. tend towards the euphemistic -- e.g., Ge "Dieses Befrüchtungsmittel soll … sich fruchtbar zeigen"; Kulikov (*-ya*-pres., 153 with nn. 373, 374) "Let this increase increase in these cows." But √*pṛc* means 'fill, engorge, mingle', and with *úpa*, the preverb of intimacy, it takes on a distinctly sexual sense. I take it as 'inseminate' in this passage, especially because of the bull's semen in c. See disc. also ad I.40.9. Moreover, the *-ana*-suffix on *upapárcana-* is one that ordinarily signals a transitive sense and often has a close connection to a transitive *-áya*-formation (though not in this case). Unlike the standard tr. I take pāda a as a nominal sentence and *pṛcyatām* in b as an impersonal. In my interpr. *upapárcana-* is the 'inseminator' -- either the bull or the bull's penis or semen, whose match is found in the hyper-virile Indra in d. My interpr. requires that that the two locc. in the 2nd hemistich (*rétasi*, *vīryè*) have a different usage and appear in different clauses from *góṣu* in b.

VI.29 Indra

VI.29.1: Three of the four pādas begin with a form of *máh-*, incl. the curious acc. sg. masc. *mahām* in d.

sepuḥ is the only perfect form attested to the root √*sap* in all of Sanskrit. Ge tr. it with present value ("Den Indra ehren die Herren") without comment, and the publ. tr. follows suit. Kü (547) argues strenuously -- and plausibly -- against this interpr. on historical grounds and takes it as "kontinuativ": "Indra haben (seit jeher) die Männer … geehrt (and ehren ihn jetzt noch)." This interpr. might fit well with the curious double participle in pāda b: *yántaḥ … cakānáḥ*. Although both Ge ("voll Verlangen nach der Gunst des Grossen kommen") and Kü ("indem die [au ihm] gehen, um die Gunst des Grossen [zu erlangen], begierig") take the two participles as independent and with their full lexical value, Ge suggests (n. 1b) that they could form a periphrastic construction, which is in fact reflected in the publ. tr.'s "as they go on finding pleasure in the great one," with *yánt-* supplying a continuative sense. The participial periphrasis might be an attempt to signal the continuative value of the perfect in pāda a, which that form cannot do on its own. The nearest thing to such a continuative in English would be "The men have (always) kept honoring Indra …" or (less clumsily) just "have (always) honored," and I would now substitute one of these tr.

Ge construes *sumatáye* with *cakānáḥ* (see tr. cited above), but forms of the root √*kā/kan* regularly take the acc. or loc., never the dative. Note that Kü supplies a verb to govern *sumatáye* and takes *cakānáḥ* absolutely. I suggest rather that *sumatáye* is parallel to *sakhyáya* in pāda a. Since √*kā/kan* can also occasionally take the gen. (cf. VII.27.1 *śávasaś cakānáḥ* "taking pleasure in your strength"), I take *maháḥ* with *cakānáḥ*, though a tr. like Kü's would also be possible: "for the sake of the partnership and benevolence of the great one, taking pleasure/desiring (it/him)."

I do not understand why *ásti* is found in pāda c, since there is no need for an overt copula, and it is difficult to interpret the verb as an existential. It is true, however, that overt copulas are more common in subordinate than in main clauses. Or perhaps *ásti* is part of the effort to express present continuative.

VI.29.3: As in I.37.14 (see comm. ad loc.), *dúvaḥ* here must be a nom. pl., not the usual sg. neut., nor the acc. pl. identified by Gr. On the somewhat aberrant syntax of this construction, see disc. by Kü (386–87). The juxtaposition of du. *pā́dā* and *dúva(ḥ)* suggests that the latter is also meant to evoke *dᵘvé*, the neut. du. 'two' with 'feet'.

Ge couches b in the 3rd ps. (see tr. cited below), but since this nominal clause is positioned between two clauses with undoubted 2nd ps. ref. to Indra (pāda a: *te*, d *babhūtha*) and itself contains no overt indications of 3rd ps., there is no reason to switch person and then switch back.

The instr. *śávasā* was omitted in the publ. tr. Although Ge tr. it with *dákṣiṇāvān* ("ist durch seine Macht ein Lohnausteiler"), the close association between *dhṛṣṇú-* and *śávas-* elsewhere in the RV (e.g., I.54.2, 56.4, I.167.9, IV.16.7, VI.66.6; cf. I.54.2 (etc.) *dhṛṣṇúnā śávasā*) suggests a tr. "As the mace-bearer, bold with (your) vast power ..." As was just noted, in the publ. tr. *śávasā* was omitted entirely; the just suggested tr. should be substituted.

Note that pāda b is a lexically variant version of 1c, which contains *vájrahastaḥ* for our *vajrī́* and *dā́tā* for our *dákṣiṇāvān*).

VI.29.4: Whatever the etymological facts -- the root affiliation of the pf. *mimikṣ-* (etc.) is disputed (see, e.g., Kü 385–89, who assigns it to √*myakṣ*, and EWA s.v. MEKṢ, esp. 374) -- the two forms of *mimikṣúḥ* in this passage (vss. 2, 3) are synchronically associated with *miśla-/miśrá-* here. As noted in the publ. intro., the three vss. form an omphalos with the theme of attachment, and the superlative *ā̆miślatama-* 'most firmly attached / entwined / intermixed' in pāda a provides the climax -- at least in my view. Not all interpr. see the contextual continuity and therefore do not tr. accordingly. E.g., Ge renders *ā̆miślatama-* as 'der anziehendste' (the most attractive), which captures neither its use in this context nor its probable connection with **meiḱ* 'mix' (EWA s.v. *miśrá-*)(though the base verb 'anziehen' has a physical dimension closer to the sense I see). I am happy to say that Old's interpr. is very close to mine, including supplying Indra with the adj.: "Der gepresste Soma soll der am besten (dem Indra) anhaftende [clinging] sein."

The referent of the loc. *yásmin* in b is unclear. The structure of the half-vs. suggests *sá* of a, namely soma, and this seems to be the standard interpr.: cf. Ge's "Der gepresste Soma ist der anziehendste, zu dem Kochspeise gekocht wird …"; also Kulikov (p. 403, p.c. from W. Knobl) "That Soma is pressed as most easily mixing, with which [, when being pressed,] cooked food is being cooked." I don't understand either of these tr., esp. the latter, and they do not make ritual sense: food is not cooked in/for/with soma (though grains can be mixed in it). Since, in my interpr., Indra is another, if unexpressed, participant in pāda a, I take *yásmin* as referring to him. This identification is supported in the larger context by *yásmin* in 2a, the beginning of the omphalos, where it refers to Indra's hand (*yásmin háste* "in which hand"), or as Ge suggests there (n. 2a), "*yásmin* ist Attraktion für *yásya*" (referring to Indra directly). These two occurrences of *yásmin* (2a, 4b) would frame the omphalos ring-compositionally. The suggested reference to Indra gets further support from passages like IV.24.7 *yá índrāya sunávat sómam adyá, pácāt paktī́r utá bhṛjjāti dhānā́ḥ* "Whoever will press soma for Indra today, will cook the cooked foods, and will roast the grains …"

The two pres. participles in cd, *stuvántaḥ … śáṃsantaḥ*, must be predicated, substituting for a main verb.

VI.29.5: Kü (221) suggests that the pf. part. *tū́tujāna-* may already be a lexicalized adj. meaning 'sich bemühend, eilend, eifrig' and tr. its occurrence in our passage quasi-adverbially, "mit Eifer," an interpr. fld by Lowe (Participles, 216). But it seems to me to have its full lexical value, deriving from √*tuj* 'thrust', in this context, where the preceding pāda describes Indra forcing apart (*bā́badhe*) the two world-halves and the following pāda compares him to a herdsman driving together (*samījamānaḥ*) his herds -- both actions requiring some amount of thrusting. In its other occurrences this part. either clearly or arguably has lexical value; cf. e.g. I.61.12 … *prá bharā tū́tujānaḥ … vájram* … "bear down the mace, thrusting …" In general, I see no reason to rob forms of lexical value unless they regularly appear in contexts in which such value would be semantically inappropriate. That a participle does not appear with a full panoply of complements does not mean that it has been sematically bleached beyond recognition -- a view that is at odds with, e.g., Lowe's approach to the issue.

Ge sharply denies (n. 5d) that *ī̆ja-* can belong to √*aj* 'drive', but he was of course writing before the full flowering of laryngeal theory. For the derivation see EWA s.v. *AJ*, p. 51.

I tr. hemistich-final *ūtī̆* with pāda c, but the fact that that pāda has an exact repetition in VI.37.5d throws that interpr. into doubt. Nonetheless, I still think *ūtī̆* is to be construed with the preceding pāda, skipping over the simile that begins pāda d. It should really be Indra's help that is in question, not that of the herdsman, an interpr. reinforced by the initial sequence in the 2nd pāda of the next vs., 6b *ūtī̆ ánūtī*, also referring to Indra.

VI.29.6: The double *evā̆* (a, c) strongly marks this as an extra-hymnic summary vs.

VI.30 Indra

VI.30.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the first pāda is an oblique ref. to the soma sacrifice that strengthens Indra for the Vṛtra-smashing; cf. III.40.7 *pītvī́ sómasya vāvṛdhe* also with Indra as subj.

VI.30.2: The use of *bhūt* with the āmreḍita *divé-dive* seems to reinforce the regularly recurring individual nature of the event: it is not that the sun is always lovely, but that it becomes visible anew, every day. This is more or less Hoffmann's view -- he cites and tr. the pāda 4x (pp. 135, 140, 267, 274) -- though he slightly changes his terms of analysis from citation to citation (e.g., 135 expressing the truth of natural laws; 140 iterative).

It is striking that both c and d end with 3rd sg. root aor. injunctives, *bhūt* and *dhāt* respectively. It is all the more striking because they don't seem to have parallel functions. As just noted, *bhūt* expresses a recurrent, hence not time-limited event, but *dhāt* seems to express a particular (cosmogonic) action in the past. Hoffmann characterizes this as "resultative Konstatierung" (214) and tr. (216) "Der Machtvolle (Indra) hat weithin die Wohnsitze verteilt." By not considering the two adjacent pādas together, Hoffmann avoids confronting this functional discrepancy; I have no explanation of it, though see comm. on the next vs.

VI.30.3: The relationship between natural activity in the present and the deeds Indra performed in the past to set that activity in motion is made clear in the 1st hemistich. The rivers continue to do the work (pāda a) -- presumably flowing through their assigned channels -- that Indra started them on by digging those channels in the mythic past (pāda b). The temporal immediacy of the rivers' work is emphasized by the opening phrase in pāda a *adyā̆ cin nū̆ cid* "even today, even now" with doubled emphasizing *cid*, while pāda b portrays Indra's original action with the augmented impf. *áradaḥ*. This offers us a clue as to how to interpret 2cd, with its functional and temporal discrepancy. As is well known and often expressed, Indra put the sun in heaven in the first place; cf., e.g., I.52.8 *ádhārayo divy ā̆ sū́ryaṃ dṛśé* "You fixed the sun fast in heaven to be seen." Since the audience would be well aware of this, they could connect the continued re-appearance of the sun every day in pāda c (*divé-dive* somewhat matching 3a *adyā̆ cin nū̆ cid* functionally) with Indra's original

deed, referred to in general terms in the preceding pāda (2b) *yā́ni dādhā́ra*. Indra's creation of the sun is also referred to in the final pāda of this hymn, 5d … *sū́ryaṃ janáyan*.

In pāda a we can possibly see a secondary pun in *ápaḥ* 'work' -- namely *apáḥ* 'waters' (see 4c, 5a), despite the accent difference.

VI.30.5: Pāda a contains two fem. pl. nouns (one clearly, one likely accusative), *apáḥ* 'waters' and *dúraḥ* 'doors', and a fem. pl. adj. *víṣūcīḥ* 'wide, wide asunder, in all/opposite directions' that could modify either or both. It also contains the preverb *ví*, stationed between the two nouns and with a metrical rest right before it that draws attention to this position. It does not, however, contain a verb. There are three syntactic possibilities (at least as I see it): 1) we should supply two different verbs, each forming a possible lexeme with *ví* and each governing one of the two nouns; we should supply a single verb, 2) which takes a double acc. or 3) which governs both nouns in parallel. (Old and Ge n. 5a lay out slightly different possiblities.) Ge opts for the second: "Du (liessest) die Gewässer durch die Tore nach allen Seiten (laufen)," supplying *asṛjaḥ* from 4d. It is not clear what the doors through which the waters surge would be. I think it is rather the first. With Ge I would supply *asṛjaḥ*, but with only *apáḥ* as obj. Although √*sṛj* is relatively rare with *ví*, 'waters' is of course regularly the object of other forms of this root, particularly *áva* as in the immediately preceding pāda. Moreover *ví* √*sṛj* is used of the release of liquid in VII.103.7 ("frog" hymn), where heated milk-drinks "attain their own release" (*aśnuvate visargám). As for the 2nd object, *ví* √*vṛ* 'unclose, open' is standard with 'doors', and I supply a form of √*vṛ* here. The point of this hemistich is that Indra opens up and disperses everything closed and enclosed. What the "doors" are in this scenario is still somewhat unclear: it could be, as in Dawn hymns, the doors of darkness and refer to Indra's flooding the world with light (note the sun and dawn in the last pāda of the vs.), or it could simply refer to Indra's general opening up of spaces, esp. the Vala cave.

In b the ppl. *dṛḷhá* is reprised from 3d, but with a nice twist. In vs. 3 Indra makes the spaces firmly fixed, but here he breaks open what *had* been firmly fixed.

VI.31 Indra

VI.31.1: On the semantic connection between the first and second hemistichs, see publ. intro. Particularly note the simple etymological figure in cd #*ví* … #*ávocanta* … *vívācaḥ*# in the half-vs. concerning the disunity of the various peoples; here the etymological sense of *carṣaṇí-* as 'bordered, separate (people)' also gets fully used. In contrast to the *ví*-s of cd, we might have expected the presence of *sám* in ab to express the unity found there, since this is the standard contrastive pairing. But the theme of unity is expressed in ab by *ékaḥ* and *hástayoḥ*: Indra alone takes them all into his two hands.

The phrase *rayipate rayīṇā́m* is clearly of the familiar "X-lord of X-es" type, though it has some twists. On the one hand, though *rayipate* is a voc. and lacks accent, *rayīṇā́m* has its usual accent even though oblique case forms in voc. phrases regularly lose their accents. On the other, the nom. *ékaḥ* should be construed with the voc. *rayipate*, not independently (that is, the pāda doesn't mean "You have become the one, o wealth-lord of wealth"). Ge takes the phrase as a predicative voc. The publ. tr. represents the construction as a

haplology, because the predicative voc. is next to impossible to render into English -- or German: Hoffmann's (Injunk. 218) "du (Indra) bist es allein geworden, o Reichtumsherr der Reichtümer" is cautionary in that regard. Ge's cited parallel IV.17.6cd *satắbhavo vásupatir vásūnām, dátre víśvā adhithā indra kṛṣṭī̄ḥ*, which closely resembles the hemistich here, reinforces the constituency of our *rayipate rayīṇā́m*.

In c the standard formula *toká- tánaya-* 'progeny (and) posterity' is interspersed with other locatives of the stakes, in the sequence *toké apsú tánaye ca sūré*; I take the *ca* here as connecting the formulaic pair and have tr. them together, with the others postponed. Cf. VI.25.4, 66.8.

VI.31.2: *cyāvayante* is the only med. form to this stem, against 16 act. transitive ones. Although in my 1983 monograph (p. 126 n. 43) I identify it as intransitive, I now think it is a passive to the transitive act.: "are bought to shaking, caused to shake" rather than a simple intr. semantically identical to *cyávate* (i.e., just 'shake'). Fear of Indra is the cause and Indra the unexpressed agent.

VI.31.3: The content of this vs. is somewhat illuminated by the similar account of the Śuṣṇa battle and the theft of the sun's wheel in IV.16.9–14, esp. vs. 12, as Old and Ge point out.

The tenses and moods of this vs. are ill-assorted; for various views, see Old, Hoffmann (Injunk. 190–91), Klein DGRV II.101–2. The first issue is the impv. *yudhya* ordering Indra to fight a mythological enemy long since defeated. Old reports with apparent, though not full-voiced, approval, Gr's (Üb) suggestion to read injunc. *yudhyaḥ*, but later points out that the gods are often urged to do a deed that actually happened in the past -- hence the transmitted impv. *yudhya* would be perfectly fine. (And Gr Wö lists the form thus.)

At the beginning of c, *dáśa* is taken by Ge (fld. by Klein; see also Gr Wö) as an impv. to √*daṃś* 'bite' (in the sense 'stachle' [spur on, goad]), with 'horses' supplied as obj. Given the discrepancy between the root meaning and the sense suggested here, as well as the absence of an expressed object, it seems best to follow Old (who cites Gr's Üb. [though curiously Gr in the Wö interprets it as Ge does]) and Hoffmann and take *dáśa* as the numeral, referring to the companions of Śuṣṇa (like the thousands [*sahásrā*] mentioned in IV.16.12 containing *śúṣṇam aśúṣam … kúyavam* as here).

A new clause begins in the middle of pāda c, introduced by *ádha* and containing the injunc. *muṣāyaḥ*, which is hard to harmonize with the impv. (*yudhya*) that precedes it. Ge (fld. by Klein) interpr. the injunc. as a functional impv., coordinated with the impv. he sees in *dáśa*; cf. Klein "Goad (thy horses) … and steal the wheel of the sun." Whereas Hoffmann takes the injunc. as "generell": "Da stiehlst du die Scheibe der Sonne," further specified in his discussion with "da … stiehlst du (immer wieder), hast du die Fähigkeit (Eigenschaft) zu stehlen." Neither the impv. nor the general reading seems satisfactory: although some injunctives function as imperatives, that usage is limited to a few stems, generally the root aorists *dāḥ, dhāḥ*, and *bhūḥ*. As for the "general" interpr., although it might make sense to say of someone (even Indra) "you have the capability/propensity to steal," it is stretching what "general" means to apply it to a single and quite specific event: "you have the capability/propensity to steal the sun's wheel." The publ. tr. follows the presential rendering

of Hoffman: "you steal" (though without the "general" nuance). I now think this is incorrect and that the injunctive simply expresses the past here. The first part of the vs. vividly evokes the attack on Śuṣṇa by imagining it before our eyes, with the speaker urging Indra to enter the fight. But the narrative then reverts to a recital of the mythical past. I would therefore alter the tr. to "So then you stole the wheel of the sun."

The last VP in the vs. brings up a different issue. The transmitted Saṃh. text is *áviverápāṃsi*, analyzed by the Pp. as *áviveḥ rápāṃsi*, from an assumed underlying **áviver rápāṃsi* with simplification of the double *r* across word boundary by the well-known sandhi rule. This interpr. is followed by Ge and Klein; cf. Klein "Thou has set aright the damages." But as in I.69.8 (q.v.) I follow Old (accepted also by Hoffmann) in reading *áviver ápāṃsi*, with *ápas-* 'labor'. This does not require alteration of the Saṃh. text.

VI.31.4: The preverb *áva* is positioned somewhat oddly for a preverb in tmesis, though it does follows the caesura and is thus adjacent to a metrical boundary. We might have expected it to migrate to the pāda-initial position. Its displacement may be to allow the pattern of verse-initial forms of the 2nd sg. pronoun to continue: 2a *tᵘvád*, 3a *tᵘvám*, 4a *tᵘvám*.

My all-purpose tr. of the (more or less lexicalized) desid. to √*śak* 'be able', namely 'do one's best', loses the etymological connection here with *śácyā śacīvaḥ* "o able one, with your ability" -- but something like 'strive to be able' implies the possibility of Indra's failure, which does not fit his divine profile.

The voc. *sutakre* is a hapax, analyzed by Gr as belonging to a *su-takri* 'very fast', but by the Pp (fld. by the standard modern interp.) as *suta-kre*. As Old points out *sunvaté suta-* would be the same type of etym. figure as *śácyā śacīvaḥ*. Sāy. glosses *abhiṣutena somena krīta*, and this in fact remains the standard interpr. For disc. of both sense and morphology (transfer of the root noun to long-vowel √*krī* to a short *i*-final) see esp. Old and Scar (87–88). Both cite as support for the purchase of Indra the very interesting passage IV.24.10 (q.v).

This is the only 5-pāda vs. (Śakvarī) in the whole run of Indra Triṣṭubh hymns (VI.17–41) and seems designed to insert the poet of this maṇḍala into the hymn and associate him with his sometime formulaic partner Divodāsa. See esp. VI.16.5bc *dívodāsāya sunvaté / bharádvājāya dāśúṣe* also in this maṇḍala. Those two Gāyatrī pādas are almost identical to ours, except for one ritual participle, *gṛṇaté*, substituting for another, *dāśúṣe*, in the Bharadvāja pāda -- and for the three additional syllables in each pāda (d *sutakre*, 3 *vásūni*) to fill out the Triṣṭubh. The addition of this extraneous material to adapt the shorter line to a different metrical form may account for the fact that *vásūni* seems to have no syntactic or semantic connection to the rest of the vs. Although Ge construes it with *áśikṣaḥ* ("wobei du … DAT … die Schätze zu verschaffen suchtest"), *śíkṣa-* does not elsewhere take an acc. (the few supposed passages in Gr are to be interpr. differently) but generally only a dative. The publ. tr. takes *vásūni* as a loosely attached acc. goal of Indra's helpful actions: "for goods" or, to make the purpose somewhat clearer, "for (them to obtain) goods." The poet would have been better off just throwing in another voc., as he did at the end of d. The addition of *vásūni* here may have been facilitated by the appearance of … *gṛṇaté vásūni#* twice elsewhere (IV.24.1, IX.69.10), in both of which *vásūni* is the object of a verb earlier in the pāda.

VI.31.5: Another tricky etymological figure is found in the hapax cmpd *satya-satvan*, both members of which have developed their own lexical senses but both derived from √*as* 'be'.

For *prapathin* see comm. ad I.166.9.

The stem *carṣaṇí-* returns as the last word of the hymn, echoing 1d, for which see publ. intro. The ring composition is rather perfunctory.

VI.32 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., the first vs. is a meta-verse in which the poet refers to his own just-composed praise; the remaining vss. constitute that praise, and all begin with the prn. *sá*, a stylistic repetition that unifies and defines the praise-hymn proper. It is noteworthy that, although the vocabulary and rhetoric leave no doubt of the identity of the recipient of the praise, the name "Indra" is not mentioned until the last vs. (5b) and the word "god" not at all. In this connection note the unaccented dat. *asmai* 'for him' in the first pāda of the hymn. Such unaccented oblique pronominal forms assume a referent already in the discourse, so Indra is present from the beginning despite not being named or even referred to at this point in the hymn, and the dative descriptors that follow in this vs., particularly *vajríṇe* 'possessing the mace' in c, simply reinforce the audience's recognition.

VI.32.2: The identity of the "two mothers/parents of the poets" (*mātárā … kavīnā́m*) has been much discussed; see esp. Old, as well as Ge (n. 2ab) and Schmidt (B+I 151). The two leading candidate pairs are Heaven + Earth (/the two World Halves) and Heaven + Dawn, but only the former seems at all likely to me. Dawn and Heaven are not a stable pairing and therefore would be unlikely to be referred to by the pregnant dual *mātárā*, whereas this dual is regularly used of Heaven and Earth. Cf. esp. IX.75.4 *prarocáyan ródasī mātárā śúciḥ* [/ IX.85.12 *prārūrucad …*], where *ródasī* 'the two World Halves' is explicitly present and where the verb is a lexical variant of our *ávāsayat* 'caused to shine'.

Why they are considered "the parents of poets" is not clear. If it isn't simply that Heaven and Earth provide *everyone* the conditions for existence and therefore count as universal parents (which seems rather lame), perhaps they become parents of poets when Indra makes them shine with the sun, calling forth the poetic effusions at the dawn sacrifice. The tenuousness of the parental connection has led to suggestions for other ways to construe *kavīnā́m*. Ge suggests that the clause is a blend of two senses: Heaven and Earth are the referents of the dual, and they are simply named as parents without indication of their offspring, but the poet also wanted to refer to Dawn as the (single) mother of the Aṅgirases, and so the gen. pl. *kavīnā́m* belongs only to this putative expression (*mātáram kavīnā́m*). This seems overly complex, and in addition I know of no evidence that Uṣas was the mother of the Aṅgirases. Old suggests that *kavīnā́m* could be construed as genitval agent with *gṛṇānáḥ*, but since that participle is in a different clause, that solution is out. Perhaps the best, if we don't want to construe it with *mātárā*, is Sāy.'s, to take *kavīnā́m* as the equivalent of a dative of benefit (*aṅgirasām arthāya*).

The part. *vāvaśānáḥ* in c has generally been ascribed to √*vaś* 'want, be eager (for)': so Gr and Lub, as well as the tr. 'begierig' of Ge and Schmidt. However, Kü has argued (478–80) that all forms of the perfect stem *vāvaś-* actually belong to √*vāś* 'bellow', not √*vaś*

-- though he sneaks some of the semantics of the latter into his glosses 'brüllen sehnsüchtig' (etc.). Although I do not want to eliminate the pf. to √*vaś* in so absolute a way as Kü, in this passage at least I think the participle embodies a pun and, moreover, the primary sense is 'bellowing', not 'being eager'. The central narrative of the Vala myth has Indra vocalizing in concert with the Aṅgirases ("the very attentive versifiers") in order to break open the cave and release the cows. No doubt he was "eager" to accomplish this, but it is the noise-making that is the focus of the myth. In this vs. we get a double view of Indra: he is both hymned (*gṛṇānáḥ* b) presumably by the Aṅgirases and also sings (/bellows) along with them, with two complementary participles, both modifying Indra and stationed at the end of adjacent pādas. The cooperation of Indra and the Aṅgirases is emphasized in the next vs.

VI.32.3: On *mitájñu-* see Scar 344; it is used here in a context very similar to *abhijñú* in III.39.5, which also concerns Indra and the Aṅgirases at the winning of cattle and contains parallel phraseology: *sákhā ha yátra sákhibhiḥ … abhijñú … gã anugmán*. The 'knee' cmpds presumably describe the stance of the warrior-poets in this conflict.

      The second hemistich contains a series of balanced etymological figures: *púraḥ purohã sákhibhiḥ sakhīyán, … kavíbhiḥ kavíḥ sán*. I am somewhat puzzled by the nom. sg. pres. part. *sán*, which is usually concessive, but which should not have that function here. The use of *sán* is esp. surprising because it breaks the parallelism of the two rhyming post-caesura phrases in cd: *… sákhibhiḥ sakhīyán, … kavíbhiḥ kavíḥ sán*. We should expect rather **kavīyán*, matching *sakhīyán*, and in fact the stem *kavīyánt-* does exist (IX.94.1 *kavīyán*, also in pāda-final position). Perhaps an exact match would have been considered too sing-songy, or else the poet wanted to emphasize that Indra is indeed a poet, in addition to his usual roles as victorious warrior and first comrade among comrades. In the latter case, the phrase might be tr. "being himself a poet along with poets."

VI.32.4: Pāda b is also found at IV.22.3b, where it is a part of an independent nominal clause. However, here it fits well within the larger clause structure, whose main verb is *prá yāhi* at the end of the vs. Cf., e.g., VIII.2.19 *ó ṣú prá yāhi vájebhiḥ*, with the *vájebhiḥ* of our b. The fact that this pāda is a self-contained repetition aids in the interpr. of the surrounding pādas a and c, both of which contain fem. instr. pls., *nīvyãbhiḥ* and *puruvírābhiḥ* respectively. Although two masc. instr. pls. intervene, *vájebhiḥ* and *śúṣmaiḥ*, they can be sequestered in the ready-made pāda b, and the two feminines of a, c can be construed together.

      Although Gr interpr. the hapax *nīvyãbhiḥ* as belonging to a fem. noun *nīvyã-*, most subsequent interpr. take it as an adj. If both *nīvyãbhiḥ* and *puruvírābhiḥ* are adjectives, we need to determine the underlying referent that they modify. As just noted, the first of these instr. is a hapax, but *puruvíra-* occurs 9x in the RV; in 6 of these occurrences it modifies *rayí-* 'wealth' (IV.44.6, VI.6.7, 22.3, 49.15, VIII.71.6, X.167.1), including 3x in VI. Given the marked predominance of this collocation, the most likely referent for *puruvíra-* in our passage is also *rayí-*. Now *rayí-* is ordinarily masc., but there are occasional fem. usages, and although I have tried to whittle down their number (see comm. ad VI.8.5), it cannot be reduced to zero. One occurrence of *puruvíra-* is a clear fem. modifying *rayí-*: X.167.1 *rayím puruvíram*. I therefore supply a form of 'wealth, riches' here, with fem. gender, as referent

for both fem. adjectives. It may be that the feminine was chosen here to signal that these instr. pls. do *not* modify the masc. instr. pl.s in b.

This now brings us to the meaning and affiliation of the hapax *nīvyà-*. This is generally and fairly plausibly connected with *nīví-* 'loincloth' or undergarment of some sort, first attested in the AV and found also in the VS and early Vedic prose. The developed meaning of our adj. is supposed to be '(something) to be wrapped and carried in a *nīví-*'. Cf. Ge's "mit in den Schurz gebundenen (Geschenken?)"; Old more expansively suggests that Indra could knot into his loin cloth a host of strong sons. He compares *nīvibhāryà-* 'to be carried/worn in the *nīví-* in AV(Ś) VIII.6.20 (=AVP XVI.81.1), which is certainly suggestive. However, this interpr. encounters a practical difficulty: just how much can be carried in a loincloth? Even Indra, whose garments are presumably more capacious than ours, would probably not be able to fit into his underwear the extravagant amount of gifts we generally ask him for. The images that come to mind — at least to my mind — are of a hobo's bundle at the end of his stick and of a stork delivering a baby in a cloth sling (presumably a diaper?) hanging from its beak, both of which have limited carrying space. The AV passage containing *nīvibhāryà-* simply confirms this. Found in a hymn "To guard a pregnant woman from demons" (in Whitney's title), the verse in question concerns possible miscarriage (*áva √pad* lit. 'fall down', but a standard idiom for miscarriage) and recommends that the pregnant woman carry/wear two remedies in her *nīví-*: VIII.6.20bcd *yád dhitáṃ māva pādi tát | gárbhaṃ ta ugraú rakṣatāṃ bheṣajaú nīvibhāryã* "What has been deposited [=embryo], let that not 'fall down'; let the two powerful remedies to be worn/carried in your *nīvi* protect your embryo." This obviously involves inserting into the garment some sort of prophylactic of modest enough size that it could be reasonably worn on an everyday basis -- not taking off the garment and stuffing it full of goodies.

The publ. tr. maintains the connection with *nīví-*, or rather with *√vyā* 'envelop', which at least some take as the root at issue (see Gr, also [critical] disc. in KEWA s.v. *nīvíḥ*; the morphology is admitted difficult, and EWA casually suggests a connection to *ní √yu* 'join' [perhaps anticipated by Ge's invocation, n. 4a, of *niyút-*], which does not seem a better alternative, as it would require an unprecedented alternate syllabification of the zero-grade of *√yu* to *iv*). The publ. tr. 'to clothe (him)' rests on the metaphor of clothing as wealth. Cf. nearby VI.35.1 *kadā stómaṃ vāsayo 'sya rāyā* "When will you clothe his praise-song with wealth?" However, I now see that I brushed aside problems of both form and function: the root *√vyā* does not distract its initial cluster, but both meter and accent require a reading *nivíyā-*; if the form is meant to be a gerundive, it should be passive in function, a usage not reflected in the translation; vowel-final preverbs do not lengthen before *√vyā*; *ní* is not found with *√vyā* in the RV. I now suggest that the form belongs to a different root entirely: *√vī* 'pursue'. This root *is* found with *ní* in the RV, though only in the intensive (see Schaeffer, 190–91), in a usage I tr. 'bear down on', though here it could mean something more like 'track down' or simply 'pursue'. Among the many objects that forms of *√vī* take, riches and the like are found (e.g., in this maṇḍala VI.12.6 *véṣi rāyáḥ*). Moreover, in root-noun cmpds with this root, vowel-final preverbs are lengthened: *pratī-vī́-* (3x), *prā-vī́-* (1x), and cf. *devā-vī́-* (12x) beside *deva-vī́-* (1x, though cf. common *devá-vīti-*). (On these lengthenings see Scar 499, 500, 501.) The derivation is not without problems. If the form is a gerundive (as I'd like), the root accent is fine, but we would expect guṇa or vṛddhi, not

zero-grade. Despite this formal problem, I think this root affiliation and formal interpr. solve many of the problems that other interpr. face, and so I would emend the tr. to "… with (riches) to be tracked down/pursued …" in place of "… to clothe (him)."

VI.32.5: *sárgeṇa … taktáḥ* is a decomposed variant of *sárga-takta-* (III.33.4, 11)(or, vice versa, the cmpd is compounded from this phrase).

   Ge terms this a "dunkler Sagenzug," but I'm not sure why it can't just be a snippet of the Vṛtra myth, after the serpent has been killed and Indra has released the pent-up waters, as I say in the publ. intro. Although vss. 2–3 concern the Vala myth, Vala and Vṛtra themes often appear in the same hymns. Ge also considers it difficult to supply the missing verb in b, but given *sárgeṇa* in a and the passively used aor. part. *sṛjānāḥ* in c, implicitly modifying the waters, the missing verb is most likely a transitive form of √ *sṛj*, with acc. *apáḥ* as obj., rather than Ge's "hat … (geleitet)." Among the many such passages, see very nearby VI.30.4 *ávāsṛjo apó áchā samudrám*, also with Indra as subj. Sim. Sāy.'s *visṛjati*.

   The root-noun cmpd. *turā-ṣáṭ* picks up *turáya* in 1b in a nod towards ring composition. I tr. 'overcoming the precipitous' rather than my 'overcoming the powerful' in the other three passages (III.48.4, V.40.4, X.55.8) in order to capture this echo.

VI.33 Indra

VI.33.1: The pāda-final *dāsvān*, to be read with distraction as *dáasvān*, resonates with *sauvaśv(i)yam* and *s(u)vaśvo* in b, despite the different sibilants.

VI.33.2: In c I tr. *ví paṇīm̐r aśāyaḥ* as "you dispersed the niggards." I now think this probably is wrong, in that I cannot find a semantic pathway there from *ví* √ *(n)aś* 'reach through', etc. The closest passage to ours that contains this multivalent lexeme is X.29.8 *vy ãnaḷ índraḥ pṛ́tanāḥ svójāḥ* "The very powerful Indra has penetrated the battling hosts.," and I would alter the publ. tr. to "you penetrated through the niggards …" The only thing that gives me pause is the very similar passage adduced by Ge, VII.19.9 … *ví paṇīmr ádāsan*# , which I tr. "They … have distanced the niggards through ritual service" (for which see comm. ad loc.).

VI.33.3: The Ārya obstacles are presumably peoples akin to us, but fighting against us.

   As noted in the publ. intro., Indra's apparent weapons of "well-placed cloaks" (*súdhitebhir átkaiḥ*) are puzzling. I think this is a reference to Indra's shape-shifting ability, to wear "different hats" in different situations -- and Ge's parallels in n. 3c suggest that he is of the same opinion. Old discusses at length and uncharacteristically endorses the suggested emendation of Ludwig/Bergaigne of *átkaiḥ* to *arkaíḥ*, though he does admit it's hard to explain how the corruption would have arisen. I think this is a fairly insuperable problem, esp. since *súdhita-* is not a particularly likely descriptor of 'chants', and is in fact not found with words of that sort.

   As also noted in the publ. intro., I suspect that *súdhita-* is a buried play on words. It is stationed between *váneva* "like the woods, trees" and *átkaiḥ*. In conjunction with the former, it evokes *svádhiti-* 'hatchet, axx'; cf., for similar context, X.89.7 *jaghā́na vṛtrám*

svádhitir váneva "He smote Vṛtra, like an axe the trees." For another pun involving *svádhiti-*, see V.32.10 where the "Heavenly Hatchet" (*devī́ svádhitiḥ*) probably plays on *svadhā́-* 'independent power'. See comm. ad loc.

As already pointed out ad VI.4.7, *nṛtama* is not suitable for the cadence of any Vedic meter, and save for this passage and VI.4.7 it avoids this position. It is found several times with *nṛṇā́m* in the cadence but in the reverse order: IV.25.4 *nṛ́tamāya nṛṇā́m*, V.30.12, X.29.2 *nṛ́tamasya nṛṇā́m*, where the oblique forms of *nṛ́tama-* support a good Triṣṭubh cadence. The order may have been flipped here, but why?

VI.33.4: The injunc. *bhūḥ* here has imperatival force, a function of the injunctive generally limited to the root aorists *dāḥ*, *dhāḥ*, and *bhūḥ*.

VI.33.5: I do not see any difference in sense between the imperatival injunc. *bhūḥ* of 4b and the pres. impv. *bhávā* in 5b.

With Old, who argues this at length, I take the Saṃhitā *mṛlīká* as loc. *mṛlīké*, rather than Pp. *mṛlīkáḥ*. See also Klein, DGRV I.314. The conjunction *utá*, which connects it with clear loc. *abhíṣṭau*, strongly supports this interpr. (Ge's interpr. is not clear.)

The opening of the 2nd hemistich, *itthā́* PARTICIPLE, matches that of the opening of the last hemistich in the preceding hymn (VI.32.5), and the *diví* opening pāda d resembles *divé-dive* in the same position in VI.32.5.

VI.34 Indra

VI.34.1: The first hemistich of this vs. (and thus of the hymn) contains a compact summary of Rigvedic poetic economy, with the god Indra both the focus of the poets' praise songs and the source of inspiration for them. This is expressed in two antithetical pādas, conjoined by double *ca*, with the oppositional preverbs *sám* and *ví* opening the pādas and two 3rd pl. verbs of motion providing the verbal expression: *jagmúḥ* and *yanti*. The first of these is accented, the 2nd not, even though the two pādas are coordinate, as the double *ca*-s show. The accent of *jagmúḥ* can be accounted for by the principle that accents the first of two explicitly contrastive verb forms, though usually such verbs are adjacent or nearly adjacent. Klein's (DGRV I.167) of contrastive double *ca* constructions has several such passages, with the 1st verb accented; e.g., I.123.12 *párā ca yánti púnar ā́ ca yanti*. Our passage is unusual only in having more matter between the verbs. Note how very parallel the pādas are: PREV *ca* 2ND-SG-PRN VERB, with the pre-verbal loc. *tvé* and abl. *tvát* carrying their own contrastive weight.

Another ex. of phrasal echoes among the Indra hymns in this cycle: *purā́ nūnáṃ ca* "previously and now" plays off against *nūnám … aparā́ya ca* "now and for the future" in the immediately preceding hymn (VI.33.5). See also possibly VI.35.5.

The Saṃhitā prevocalic form *stutáya* is universally read/interpr. as underlying nom. pl. *-aḥ*, beginning with the Pp. (also Gr, Ge, Lub, Kü 584), but HvN unaccountably restore *-e*, which must simply be a lapse.

The dvandva *ukthārkā́* (to be distracted to *uktha-arkā́*) is most likely a neut. pl. not a dual masc., though plural dvandvas are far rarer than dual dvandvas in early Vedic. This is

one of the earliest exx. See Whitney Gr. §1255e; Macd VG §265; VGS p. 269; AiG II.1.38, 156. The 2ⁿᵈ member *arká-* is itself masc. when independent.

VI.34.2: The heavy presence of *puru*-PAST PART. cmpds in the first hemistich (*puruhūtáḥ … purugūrtáḥ … purupraśastáḥ*) was prepared for by the fem. pl. *pūrvī́ḥ* in 1a and the (unrelated) *purā́* in 1c.

It is difficult to render the gerundive + injunctive phrase *anumā́dyo bhū́t*; "has become one to be cheered on" is excessively fussy.

VI.34.3: To say that praises don't *harm* Indra seems a little odd: who would think that they would?

nákṣanti is one of the few examples where *íd* by itself seems to induce accent on the verb; most of the putative examples (see Gr s.v. *íd*, §5, p. 206) involve pāda-initial verbs that could owe their accent to their position. I am not entirely certain, however, that this passage exemplifies this property of *íd*, since initial *índram* in b could be enjambed over the pāda break, and *nákṣanti* start a new clause. V.32.5 presents an undoubted ex. of *íd* inducing verb accent.

I interpr. *yádi* in c as **yad ī́*, i.e., an example of the enclitic acc. *ī́* univerbated with a preceding *yád* (see my 2002 "RVic sīm and īm," Fs. Cardona). This is a particularly clear ex., because of the parallel *yád* later in the pāda (**yád ī́ stotāra śatáṃ yát sahásram* "when a hundred praisers, when a thousand"), where an imbalance of subordinators ("if a hundred praisers, when a thousand …") would not make sense. Moreover the form is followed by a cons. cluster (*yádi stotāraḥ*), so that the meter would be unaffected by **ī́* shortened to *-i*.

VI.34.4–5: The identical openings of these two vss., *ásmā etád*, pick up the last clause of vs. 3, *śáṃ tád asmai*, and invite the two phrases to be interpr. as separate clauses, with *śám* to be supplied from 3d, as both Old and Ge point out.

My interpr. of the rest of ab is generally inspired by Ge.

The form *mimikṣá* is interpr. by the Pp. as *mimikṣáḥ*, though *mimikṣé* is also possible and is a strong alternative. In the former case, it would be an adj. built to the verbal stem *mimikṣ-*, parallel to adj. *mimikṣú-*; in the latter a 3ʳᵈ sg. mid. pf. The pf. interpr. is followed by Gr and Kü (386), though Kü (n. 690) does allow the possibility of the thematic adj. as an alternative. AiG (II.2.86) and Lub take it as an adj., and Old and Ge consider both possibilities, but favor the Pp. reading. I too take it as an adj., in part on grounds of syntactic parallelism: 4ab and 5ab are quite parallel. They both begin with the *ásmā etád* clause discussed above; then a ritual feature (soma *sómaḥ* / praise hymn *stotrám*) is announced as in/for Indra (*índre* / *índrāya*), with the verbal notion connecting the offering and the god expressed by an augmented passive aor. (*ny àyāmi* / *avāci*) in the latter part of b. If we have a finite verb *mimikṣé* in the early part of b, it chops the pāda into two clauses and destroys the parallel structure (a point made somewhat differently by Old). Moreover, the simile in 4a *divy àrcéva māsā* (with *diví* parallel to *índre*; see also Old) works better if construed with *ny àyāmi* than with *mimikṣé*, but given the word order it would have to belong to the *mimikṣé* clause if *mimikṣá* stands for that verb.

As for the just-mentioned simile, I am entirely persuaded by the gist of Ge's suggestion (n. 4ab) that *māsắ* should signal an elliptical dual *sū́ryā-mā́sā* 'sun and moon', the two heavenly bodies set in heaven, as soma is set in Indra. However, he deals rather wispily with the stumbling block to this interpr., namely the accentuation of *māsắ*, proper to the instr. sg., instead of the expected dual *mā́sā*. Judging from his lapidary treatment, he would by preference read (that is, emend to) du. **mā́sā* directly, with *arcā́* also du. Hence his tr. "wie (Sonne und) Mond, die beiden Strahlenden." But if *māsắ* must be maintained, he would interpr. (see n. 4ab) *arcéva* as containing *arcáḥ, the nom. sg. to an otherwise unattested them. stem *arcá-* and exhibiting irregular sandhi, and *māsắ* as an instr. of accompaniment, rather like the expression in X.138.4 *māséva sū́ryaḥ*, in which *māséva* presumably conceals the instr. *māsắ* construed with nom. sg. *sū́ryaḥ*: "like the sun with the moon," that is, "the sun and the moon." I would very much like to rescue Ge's interpr. based on an elliptical dual, an interpr. reflected in the publ tr., because I think it has to be fundamentally correct in context. But it is going to be challenging. I would prefer not to emend *māsắ*, and I also do not think that excavating *arcáḥ* irregularly from *arcéva* is the way to go. My flimsy alternative proposal (though followed by Old; see below) is that *arcéva* contains the nom. sg. of a fem. -ā stem *arcā́-* (found in the Br., in a different sense) 'shining/beaming one' → 'sun'. Old, flg. Ludwig, in fact also opts for a nom. *arcā́* 'der Glanz', though he connects this Glanz with the moon: "wie zum Himmel der Glanz vom Monde (gelenkt wird)." For the connection of the sun with forms belonging to √*arc*, see V.79.9, VIII.7.36 *sū́ro arcíṣā*, and of course it is regularly said that the sun is set/placed *diví* 'in heaven' (e.g., XV.85.2 *diví sū́ryam adadhāt* "when he placed the sun in heaven"; see disc. in my 2010 Fs. Melchert article on the "Placer of the Sun"). I suggest that this stem *arcā́-* is found only here because it was mobilized to contrast with *-arkā́* 'hymns' at the end of 1d. I would now alter the tr. to "the soma has been set firmly in Indra, like the shining one [=the sun] along with the moon in heaven." Note that an instr. of accompaniment is used with a nom. in lieu of a coordinate expression in the 2nd hemistich: *hávanāni yajñaíḥ* "our invocations along with our sacrifices" = "our invocations and sacrifices."

Note that under this interpr., the supposed root noun *árc-* would no longer exist, since this stem rests only on this form in all of Skt., supposedly the instr. *arc-ắ*. In fact, the existence of this root noun was already denied by Schindler in his 1972 diss. (s.v.), because of its full grade, and he rehearses the various alternative proposals, including Hoffmann's (oral) suggestion that *arcắ* is the loc. to *arcí-*, a stem that has the merit of existing, though it is hard to fit it semantically into this passage. The actual root noun to √*arc/ṛc* 'shine/sing' is of course *ŕc-* 'verse', which gives our text its name.

In c the phrase (*abhí*) *sáṃ yád ā́paḥ* "when the waters con(verge) (on him)" reminds us of the opening of the hymn, where songs converge on Indra. I do not pretend to understand the construction of cd. Indra is obviously the unexpressed object of *vāvṛdhuḥ* (cf. 3b *índram … vardháyantīḥ*) and the comparandum for the simile that opens the hemistich, *jánaṃ ná dhánvan* "like a man in the desert," but the verbless *yád* clause seems rather casually embedded and with the *yád* unusually positioned after two preverbs (unless *abhí* should be taken only with somewhat distant preceding *jánam*).

VI.34.5: The balance and reciprocity between god and worshipers evident earlier in the hymn also characterizes its ending. The last thing said about Indra is that he is our 'strengthener' (*vṛdháḥ* 5d), just as our offerings, both material and verbal, have strengthened him (*vardháyantīḥ* 3b, *vāvṛdhuḥ* 4d).

VI.35 Indra
This hymn is tr. by Schmidt in B+I 152–53.

VI.35.1: Ge takes *bráhma* as an abstract "Hohepriesterschaften," standing for the personal pl. *brahmāṇaḥ* (n. 1a). I see no reason to take *bráhma* in any sense other than its usual 'sacred formulation(s)' (pl. in this instance)(nor does Schmidt, who tr. "Wann werden die Gedichte ihren Sitz auf dem Wagen haben?" [152]). The vs. concerns the exchange of priestly praise for material goods bestowed by the god: the clothing of our praise with Indra's wealth (c) and the bejeweling of our insights with his prizes (d) are vivid metaphors. The first pāda contains a likewise striking image: the chariots in which our formulations take up their position are presumably the chariot(s) Indra gives us, which will also be heaped with goods. It is our production of the formulations that brings the chariots. The intent of this image is made clearer by vs. 3b *viśvápsu bráhma kṛṇávaḥ*.

Both *bhuvan* and *dāḥ* are subjunctives, or at least have subjunctive function. Contra Hoffmann (246), I am inclined to take *dāḥ* as a real subjunctive (<*dā-a-s),* though without metrical distraction, not an injunctive, while both of us take *bhuvan* as subj. here.

VI.35.2: Both Ge and Schmidt take the first hemistich as depicting a hostile encounter between two sets of men and heroes expressed by the verb *nīḷáyāse* (Ge: "… dass du Herren mit Herren, Mannen mit Mannen in Kampf verwickeln wirst?"; HPS [153] "… dass du … handgemein (?) werden lässt?"); Old is less certain but suggests that "kämpfen machen, überwinden" is expected. But the basis of this hapax demon. *nīḷáyāse*, namely *nīḷá-* 'nest', invites an interpr. depicting a more intimate and amicable relationship (like the adj. *sánīḷa-* 'of the same nest', referring to brothers and comrades), and the middle voice reinforces that sense. In my 1983 monograph on *-áya*-formations, I follow an interpr. suggested by Insler, that the verb means 'accept as equals' (pp. 84–85). Although I think that may be an implication, I now think it can be taken more literally: 'put in your own nest'. Indra is bringing our fighting men into intimate contact with his own (the Maruts and/or Aṅgirases [the latter being mentioned in vs. 5]) under his auspices; with these now conjoined forces he can win the contests and the cattle at stake.

The accent of the denom. *nīḷáyāse* (expect **nīḷayāse*) has been retracted because the form is transitive (acc. *nṝn … vīrắn*) and has been attracted into the *-áya*-transitive / causative class (see my 1983 monograph).

VI.35.3: This vs. is a reprise of and variation on vs. 1. Like vs. 1, it treats the rewards that accrue to verbal praise, and in fact repeats two of the three types of verbal products found in vs. 1 (*bráhma* 1a/3b, *dhíyaḥ* 1d/3c), with *stómam* (1c) and *hávanāni* (3d) being the novel terms. *bráhma* and *hávanāni* are modified by bahuvrīhis that express the material reward they will obtain ('all goods' [*viśvápsu*] and 'cattle as bounty' [*gómaghā*] respectively). In

the c pāda the chariot motif of 1a returns in slightly different form: we "team up" our insights, as Indra does his teams (*niyútaḥ*) -- the teams that, pulling his chariot (cf., e.g., I.135.4 *rátho niyútvān*), will bring Indra and his bounty to the sacrifice, where the "teams" of insights will be exchanged for the goods he brings.

On *viśvápsu-* see comm. ad I.148.1.

VI.35.4: Both *jaritré* and *gómaghā* are repeated from the previous vs. (where they were not in the same clause), though the latter has changed gender: in 3c it is neut. pl., while in 4a the same sandhi form is fem. pl. and represents underlying *gómaghā(ḥ)*. This bahuvrīhi has spawned two parallel descriptors: *áśva-ścandrā(ḥ)* and *vāja-śravasaḥ*, all three modifying fem. pl. *pŕkṣaḥ*.

The tr. 'lay on' (that is, provide, often lavishly, often of meals or feasts) is an English idiom that precisely calques *ádhi dhehi*.

I take *íṣaḥ … dhenúm* as a double acc. with √*pī* 'swell' -- lit., 'swell the cow the refreshments', that is, 'swell the cow with refreshments'. Ge hesitates (n. 4c), but in the tr. opts for two acc. in parallel ('swell the refreshments, (swell) the cow'), as does Schmidt (p. 153).

The root-noun cmpd *surúc-* (9x) is generally a bahuvrīhi meaning 'having good light, very bright', as in II.2.4 *tám … candrám iva surúcam* "him [=Agni] very bright like gold." For just this passage Gr posits a substantivization: f. 'heller Glanz'. This is unnecessary, as *surúcaḥ* here can be a fem. pl. acc. picking up and modifying f. pl. *íṣaḥ* in c (and indeed the glittering *pŕkṣaḥ* in b). It obviously forms an etymological figure with the opt. *rurucyāḥ*.

As for this verb, it should have transitive/causative value ('make shine / illuminate'), and it therefore functionally overlaps with the redupl. aor. *árūruca-*. This overlap is complicated by the fact that several apparent pf. forms *rurucuḥ* also have this value, in some of which lengthening the redupl. to **rūrucuḥ* would provide a better cadence, though in our passage such a lengthening would produce a worse cadence. For disc. of these ambiguous forms see comm. ad IV.7.1, 16.4. As I say there, because the 3rd sg. pf. *ruroca* and the pf. part. are intransitive, I am inclined to think that the transitive 3rd pl. forms originated in the redupl. aor. but were absorbed by the pf., with shortening of the redupl. vowel.

VI.35.5: As noted in the publ. intro., the first hemistich of this vs. is quite unclear; I am not at all certain my interpr. is correct, but I don't think it's appreciably worse than any others, which I will not treat at length. One observation about it, which doesn't really aid in its interpr., is that it seems to play off the Agastya Triṣṭubh refrain (I.165.15d, etc.) *vidyā́meṣáṃ vṛjánaṃ jīrádānum* "May we find refreshment and a community having lively waters." A large proportion of the occurrences of *vṛjánam* are found in that refrain. The *jinva* at the end of our vs. picks up the *jīrá-* of the refrain, and its *íṣam* is matched by our *íṣaḥ* in 4c.

I'd also point out that the antithetical temporal expressions we noted in the two previous hymns, *nūnám … aparā́ya ca* "now and for the future" (VI.33.5) and *purā́ nūnáṃ ca* "previously and now" (VI.34.1), may be echoed by *nūnám … anyáthā cid* "now and also otherwise."

But let us now turn to the serious problems of the vs.: 1) there is apparently no verb (or anything else) to govern *tám … vṛjánam*; 2) there is no verb to govern the presumed acc. *dúraḥ* 'doors' in the rel. clause; 3) esp. if *gṛṇīṣé* is taken to be the verb of the rel. cl. and a 2ⁿᵈ sg. passive 'you are praised' (as it is by most tr.), since the passive can't govern an object, and 'doors' would be quite an outlandish object anyway.

My interpr. starts with the two things I think we can hold onto:

1) the collocation *ví dúraḥ* inevitably brings to mind the idiom *ví dúraḥ √vṛ* 'open the doors', used inter alia for the breaking of dawn, which is also often homologized to the opening of the Vala cave (e.g., VII.79.4), an act ascribed to Indra. This is mentioned several times in this Indra cycle (VI.17.6, 18.5, 30.5). Thus the most likely way to interpr. the first part of 5b *śúro yác chakra ví dúraḥ* is as a rel. cl. referring to this action, supplying the verb √*vṛ* (or sim.): "When, o able one, as champion you (open[ed]) wide the doors." If we thus interpr. the rel. cl., the supposed passive *gṛṇīṣé* is displaced from its supposed role as verb in that clause (though we could, of course, assume the 'open' idiom was participial and *gṛṇīṣé* could then be the main verb).

2) *gṛṇīṣe* (generally unaccented) is otherwise almost entirely a 1ˢᵗ sg. *-se* form, "I (shall) sing/praise," so the passive interpr. just mentioned is not attractive in any case. In the last vs. of a hymn such an assertion of a 1ˢᵗ ps. praiser is certainly apposite and expected.

The gist of my interpr. rests on these two observations. I take *gṛṇīṣé* as a 1ˢᵗ sg. and not part of the dependent clause, which expresses the formulaic 'open the doors'. *gṛṇīṣé*'s object is *vṛjánam* at the beginning of the hemistich. The verb *gṛṇīṣé* is accented because it immediately follows a subord. clause. The major problem that I see is that this requires that the *yád* clause be embedded, and I don't see any way out of that. I would also prefer if Indra were the object of the praise, not (merely) the *vṛjánam*. He might indeed be represented by the init. *tám*, which would then not modify *vṛjánam*. This would produce an alternative tr. "Him here and now do I sing, as (I do/did) otherwise the community, when …"

I am not entirely satisfied with this interpr., but I do not have anything better to offer (nor do other interpr.).

The rest of the vs. is much less problematic. The most important thing to note is that the *dhenú-* 'milk-cow' must be masc. because of the adj. *śukradúghasya* 'having bright/clear milk'. This gender not only goes against nature, but also against the phrase in 4c *sudúghām … dhenúm*, with the fem. adj. *sudúghām*. The gender switch is obviously deliberate, and the likely reason for it was already formulated by Sāy.: that this is a reference to the soma-plant and the soma juice that is milked out of it. (Both Ge and Schmidt take the two genitives separately, which rescues the gender of *dhenóḥ* but ignores the shock value of the gender switch.)

That pāda b has to do with opening the Vala cave is supported by the mention of the Aṅgirases in d.

Also in d, *bráhmaṇā* is ring-compositionally related to *bráhma* in 1a.

VI.36 Indra

VI.36.1: Although the stem *viśvá-janya-* is of course a bahuvrīhi and has the basic meaning 'possessing all peoples' vel sim., the point here must be that all peoples prepare soma for

Indra, hence my 'stemming from all peoples' referring to the soma drinks. The reciprocity between the people's offering of exhilarating drinks and Indra's apportioning of prizes (c) is clear.

The publ. tr. renders the injunc. *dhāráyathāḥ* as a present; it could also have past value: "when/as you upheld …"

As it is elsewhere (cf. W. E. Hale, Ásura- *in Early Vedic Religion,* 59–62), *asuryà-* 'lordship' is ascribed to Indra, and the fact that he maintains this lordship 'among the gods' (*devéṣu*) demonstrates once again that *devá- / ásura-* is not yet an antithetical or hostile pairing in the RV. This same Indra cycle contains a similar expression: VI.20.2 *ánu … asuryàṃ devébhir dhāyi víśvam.*

VI.36.2: Since verbal forms of √*yaj* are not otherwise found with *ánu* nor does the lexeme *ánu-prá* √*yaj* occur anywhere else, I take *ánu prá yeje* as a technical reference to the fore- and after-offerings (*prayājá-, anuyājá-,* already attested in late RV). The *ánu* may have been included because of the idiom *ánu* √*dā* 'concede' in the next pāda.

Contra Ge, Klein (DGRV I:224–25), and Scar (115–16), who take c with d, I construe b and c together, with the two datives *vīryàya* (b) and *syūmagŕbhe dúdhaye 'rvate* (c) parallel to each other and serving as the indirect object to *dadhire ánu* 'have conceded' in b. This allows *ca* at the end of c to take its usual role conjoining NPs, rather than serving as a clausal conjunction (joining b and cd) as Klein is forced to take it. In either case the *ca* is unusually positioned, but as a clausal conjunction its position might be more jarring.

This interpr. also allows a better case frame in d: *ápi* √*vṛj krátum* + LOC is an idiom of subordination; cf. X.48.3 *máyi devāso 'vṛjann ápi krátum* "To me have the gods bent their will" (sim. X.120.3). But for both Ge and Klein the dative of c must take the place of the usual loc.; e.g., Klein "And to (him), the bucking courser grabbing the reins, do they direct their determination in the battle against the obstacle." In my interpr. I supply a loc. 'to him' in d, likely gapped because of the presence of the circumstantial loc. 'at the smashing of Vṛtra/obstacles' (*vṛtrahátye*), with the dat. of c more naturally construed with the verb in b, *ánu* √*dhā*, which ordinarily takes a dative.

With Gr, Ge, and Klein, I take the root noun cmpd. *syūma-gŕbh-* in c as having the transitive value "pulling at [/grabbing] the reins," expressing the impatience of the "headstrong charger" that is Indra. Curiously, Scar (115–16) gives it the passive sense "der … beim Zügel gepackt wird," indicating that the same headstrong charger has to be reined in. Although this interpr. is in principle possible, in practice it seems unlikely that the poets would dare to consider (much less desire) curbing Indra's impetuous rush.

VI.36.3: I take fem. pl. *sadhrīcīḥ* as implicitly modifying all the NPs, though attracted to the gender of the adjacent noun, fem. *ūtáyaḥ.* So, it seems, also Ge.

VI.36.5: In b Ge takes *rāyaḥ* as subject and supplies the same stem as obj., on which gen. sg. *aryáḥ* is dependent, while apparently supplying a form of the same root √*sthā* (or √*as*) with *abhí* as I do: "Wie der Himmel über der Erde, so (sollen) die Reichtümer sich über die (der) hohen Herren (erheben)" (sim. Thieme, Fremd. 59). The publ. tr. is different, in taking *rāyaḥ* as an acc. despite the accent (expect *rāyáḥ, but the nom. form is sometimes found for

the acc.) and supplying Indra as subject of a supplied impv. to *abhí* √ *sthā* (/*as*): "Like heaven over the earth, sur(mount) the riches of the stranger." However, I now see that Ge must be correct, because the expression here has to be interpr. alongside similar phrasing elsewhere in this Indra cycle: VI.20.1 *dyaúr ná … abhí bhŭma aryás, tasthaú ráyiḥ …*, which I tr. "wealth … surmounts (the wealth) of the stranger, … as heaven does the earth." This passage contains the same two-term simile *dyaúr ná (…) bhŭma*, the same NP *ráyi-aryáḥ*, and the same preverb *abhí*. However, it is more explicit, in having an overt finite verb *tastháu*, and, most important, in having an undeniable nominative *ráyiḥ*, which must correspond to *dyaúḥ* in the simile. The publ. tr. of our passage should therefore be altered to "Like heaven over the earth, let (our) riches sur(mount) (those) of the stranger."

       Ge takes *cakānáḥ* in c as passive: "auf dass du … bei uns beliebt seiest." But the pf. *cake*, including its fairly frequent participle *cakāná-*, is always "active" in sense: 'take pleasure, desire'; cf. Kü 142–43. In the publ. tr. I moved the instr. *śávasā* immediately preceding the part. to be construed with the 2ⁿᵈ part. *cékitānaḥ*, as a parallel to *váyasā* ("showing yourself with your strength and your vigor …"). I am now uncertain about this because of two similar passages: V.3.10 … *sáhasā cakānáḥ* with an *s*-stem instr. as here and VII.27.1 … *śávasaś cakānáḥ* with a gen. of the same *s*-stem as here, both immediately preceding *cakānáḥ* as here. Although I still don't think *śávasā* should be construed directly with *cakānáḥ* as the source of enjoyment, I now think it probably should remain in the larger participial phrase: "so that you with your strength will keep finding enjoyment in us …"

VI.37 Indra

VI.37.1: I take *svàrvān* as implicitly conjoined with *kīríḥ*, with the pair displaying the range of mortals who call upon Indra. This is one of Old's suggestions; alternatively he suggests that it is proleptic, but this seems overly complex — though it seems to underlie Ge's interpr.: "denn auch die Arme ruft dich erleuchtet."

VI.37.1–2: On the shift in referent between the *hárayaḥ* in 1b (Indra's horses) and the one in 2a (soma drops) see publ. intro.

VI.37.2: Accented *asyá* in c presupposes the gen. phrase in d *mádasya somyásya*, even though the two genitives are construed differently: the one in c as (partitive) gen. with √ *pā* 'drink', the one in d dependent on *rǎjā*.

VI.37.2–3: The implicit identification of Indra's horses with the soma drops is reinforced by the use of the part. *ŕjyantaḥ* for both (2b, 3c).

VI.37.3: It is not possible to respect the hemistich boundary in tr. without awkwardness.

VI.37.4: Ge (fld. by Klein, DGRV I: 250) takes *váriṣṭhaḥ* as an ex. of hypallage. standing for **váriṣṭhām* and characterizing the *dákṣiṇā*. This must be because they take the adj. as meaning 'broadest', splv. to *urú-* (though I don't quite see why the priestly gift could be broad if Indra cannot be). By contrast I follow Gr in consider some forms of the stem

váriṣṭha- as 'choicest, most excellent', a splv. to *vára-* 'choice', though of course that adj. should not, originally, produce a primary splv. (Note, however, that **váratama-* would be metrically unfavorable.) AiG II.2.452–53 allows such a splv. in late Vedic, though not for our period, but I see no reason why it can't be early, encouraged by semantically and phonologically parallel *vásiṣṭha-* 'best' (→ Vasiṣṭha).

Ge and Klein also take the *ca* in 4d as subordinating d to c (cf. Klein "through which … thou dost avoid straitened circumstances, when … though dost deal out the gifts of the lord"). I do not understand the need for this. Since pāda c is a rel. cl. beg. with *yáyā*, there is no reason that d cannot still be in the domain of that relative, accounting for the accented verb *dáyase*, and the action of d does not seem logically subordinate to that in c. I therefore take *ca* here as conjoining parallel subordinate clauses.

In fact, d is a better candidate for rel. cl. with *yáyā* than c is: assuming that *yáyā* refers to the *dákṣiṇā* of pāda a, it easily makes sense with d: "with which (priestly gift) you distributed …," but rather less sense with c. Why should the *dákṣiṇā* enable Indra to avoid *áṃhas-*? In fact, I wonder if, at least in c, the passage has been adapted from an expression with a different feminine referent. Perhaps a passage like II.34.15a *yáyā radhrám pāráyathāti áṃhaḥ* "with which you carry the feeble one across difficult straits" (with both *yáyā* and *áṃhaḥ*, polarized as here), where the referent of *yáyā* is *ūtíḥ* 'help' (15c).

The last item on which I disagree with Ge (/Klein) is the function/identity of *sūrī́n*. Flg. Ludwig, they take this as standing for the gen. pl. (hence, "the bounties of our patrons"). But there is no need for this, as Old also points out, since the apparent acc. pl. can be syntactically accommodated -- either as a parallel to *maghā́* ("apportion bounties [and] patrons") or, as both Old and I prefer, in a double acc. construction with *dáyase ví*: "apportion bounties (to) patrons." The point of the latter is that the patrons are the middlemen between the gods and the priest/poets: Indra gives the *sūrí-* riches and they redistribute them to the ritual workers. It would seem odd indeed to have Indra distributing riches that *already* belonged to the patrons, as the genitive would imply.

VI.37.5: As the last pāda of this vs. shows, Indra is the ultimate super-patron.

VI.38 Indra

The publ. intro. states that reference is unclear in the hymn "until the last pāda of vs. 2"; this is somewhat misleading, in that a form of *índra-* is found in the *second* pāda of vs. 2 -- though the identity of the other referent there remains cloudy.

VI.38.1: The unclear reference just noted is found in the first word of the hymn, 3rd sg. aor. *ápāt* 'he has drunk', whose subject is not expressed. On the one hand, this is an Indra hymn and Indra is the prototypical drinker of soma (cf., e.g., the opening of nearby VI.40.1 *índra piba*, as well as *ápāḥ* in the 1st vs. of the next hymn, nearly identical to our verb and with Indra clearly meant as subj.), so we might expect Indra as subject. On the other, the most likely referent of the almost immediately following nominative *citrátamaḥ*, who bears the invocation upward, is Agni, and as the mouth of the gods, he can also be considered to drink (though not usually soma). Parsimony might suggest that the two unidentified subjects in the first hemistich are identical, hence Agni. In the publ. tr. I supply Agni, with ?, but I am not

at all certain that the first subject isn't Indra. Or, more likely, that the poet meant to leave it open.

The subject of cd is also left unspecified; again I assume Agni: if he is embarking upward in ab, then the journey (*yā́man*) in c is most likely his, though Ge supplies Indra. The only nominative attribute, *sudā́nuḥ*, is no help, as it is used of Agni and Indra about equally. What I take from the uncertainties of reference in this vs. is that the poet wants to keep us guessing.

The pāda-final splv. *citrátamaḥ* produces a bad Triṣṭubh cadence. There is no obvious way to fix it, and the other 5 instances of this stem are found elsewhere in the line, where they work metrically.

VI.38.1–2: As noted in the publ. intro., I think vs. 2 functions as complementary to 1: in the first vs. the *índra-hūti-* is conveyed *up* to Indra (presumably in heaven); in 2 he -- and his ears -- are brought *down here* to the *devá-hūti-* performed at the sacrifice.

VI.38.2: In b *ghóṣāt* is morphologically ambiguous: it can be a subjunctive to the them. pres. *ghóṣa-* (accented because first in its pāda) or the abl. to the them. noun *ghóṣa-* (so Gr). For possible interpr. involving this abl., see Old. By contrast I follow Ge (and Lub) in taking it as a verb form, parallel to *tanyati* later in the pāda. The major problem this interpr. poses is how to construe gen. *índrasya*. Under the abl. interpr. of *ghóṣāt*, the gen. is dependent on that noun, but without that support it must find another role in the following clause (to which it must belong, because *tanyati* is unaccented and cannot start a new clause). With Ge (n. 2b) I take it as loosely construed with *bruvāṇáḥ*, though in a different sense from Ge's "der sich zu Indra Bekennende" -- rather as the topic of the speech.

As for the subject of *ghóṣāt* and *tanyati*, I think it anticipates the *deváhūti-* of c. This of course creates a problem of its own, in that *bruvāṇáḥ* should be fem. if *deváhūti-* is the referent. But given the poet's general evasiveness about referents, I think in b we're dealing with an as-yet-unidentified verbal product, which is then specified as *deváhūti-* (the same *índra-hūti-* of 1b) in c.

VI.38.2–4: After the absence of overt referents in vs. 1, starting with 2b we have a form of *índra-* in every hemistich through vs. 4 (2b *índrasya*, 2d *índram*, 3b *índram*, 3d *índre*, 4a *índram*, 4d *índram*). His name is again absent in the final vs. of the hymn, vs. 5, suggesting that this pattern is deliberate and a species of ring composition, marked by absence not presence. The next hymn (VI.39) also shows this structure, with the three middle verses (2–4) united by the shared initial deictic *ayám* and the first and last (1, 5) standing out against this pattern.

VI.38.3: As usual, the enclitic *vaḥ* 'for you' refers to the priestly colleagues of the poet on whose behalf he acts; as is also usual, the Engl. tr. has to be heavier and more prominent than the recessive 2nd position accentless *vaḥ*.

The second hemistich contains, in my view, a double *ca* construction conjoining two clauses, in which the first verb, *dadhiré*, is accented (and the 2nd, *vardhat*, is not). Klein (DGRV I.176–77) notes that the whole could be interpr. "as a sentential X *ca* Y *ca*

construction" (as I do), but favors separating the functions of the two *ca*-s, taking the first *ca* as conjoining the two nouns in the sequence *bráhmā ca gíraḥ*, while he allows (DGRV I.226–27) that the 2nd *ca* is a clausal conjunction. This seems like a desperate makeshift to avoid the (to me, at least) obvious connection between the two *ca*-s— esp. as it requires that in *bráhmā ca gíraḥ* the usual X Y *ca* construction be replaced by the much less usual inversion, Y *ca* X (or in Klein's parlance, X *ca* Y: DGRV I.169ff.). (According to Klein [DGRV I.51 and 169], there are 464 occurrences of X Y *ca* and 45 of X *ca* Y -- a factor of 10.) In my opinion, the accented *dadhiré* is an example of the usual type of contrastive verb accent, and the *ca … ca* construction is a hyped version of "both … and," viz., "not only … but also."

      In d *ádhi vardhat* is syntactically somewhat problematic. It lacks an overt acc. obj., even though active forms of *várdha-* (and other stems to this root) are overwhelmingly transitive -- a value reinforced by no less than 4 pāda-initial occurrences of transitive active *várdha-* in the very next vs. (4a + b *várdhāt*, 4c *várdha*, 4d *várdhān*), all with Indra as explicit or implied object! It is inconceivable to me that Indra is not meant as the object in 3d as well, despite locative *índre* in this pāda, but I seem to be alone it that view. Note Ge's intransitive "'... möge an Indra stark werden," fld. by Klein (177) "will find strength in Indra." Gotō (1st Klasse, 291) sees the problem, but suggests that "we" are the gapped object: "'...macht [uns?] bei Indra stark." In my opinion, the aberrant loc. is conditioned by *ádhi*, which when independent often takes a loc. (see Gr, s.v. *ádhi*, p. 45, nos. 13–17). *ádhi* √*vṛdh* is found only here, and once in the middle (IX.75.1), in all of Skt. acdg. to MonWms. My "puts strength in Indra" reflects the transitive periphrasis I see in this lexeme. The syntactically clearer forms of act. *várdha-* in the next vs. can be viewed as a type of poetic repair.

VI.38.4: The singular number of both forms of *várdhāt* (a, b) is worthy of a small note. The subject of the first is the conjoined NP *yajñá utá sómaḥ*, with 2 singular nouns. As often, the verb agrees with one of them (presumably the nearer one), rather than being in the dual, as would also be possible. In b the subject is the even more complex NP *bráhma gíra ukthā́ ca mánma*, of which the two middle terms are clearly plural (fem. and neut. respectively), while the two neut. -*n*-stems that bookend the phrase, *bráhma* and *mánma*, could be either sg. or pl. Flg. Ge (sim. Klein DGRV I.198–99), I take the first as sg. and the last as pl., again assuming that the verb agrees with the nearer term, namely *bráhma*. But it is possible that *bráhma* is actually pl. and that this is an ex. of the famous but fairly rare construction of a sg. verb with a neut. pl. subj. Although there is no way to tell, I'm tempted to alter the tr. to pl.: "… the sacred formulations will strengthen," given the undoubted pl. of the two middle terms and the possible pl. of the last one.

      yā́man reprises the same word in 1c, though they have somewhat different meanings.

      Although nom. pl. *dyā́vaḥ* ordinarily refers to 'heavens', in this case the context clearly establishes the meaning 'days'.

VI.38.5: The half-verse boundary has to be breeched in tr. to avoid awkwardness.

After the spate of act. transitive forms of √*vṛdh* in vs. 4 (and 3d), the middle pf. part. *vāvṛdhānám* provides a contrastive intransitive/passive, agreeing with Indra, the object of the transitive forms.

Contra Ge, I take *ásāmi* with *vāvṛdhānám* despite the pāda boundary, on the basis of VI.19.2 *yó vāvṛdhé ásāmi* in this same Indra cycle.

On the *ca* in b, see Klein, DGRV I.54–55.

VI.39 Indra

The whole hymn is tr. and disc. by Schmidt (B+I 149–51).

VI.39.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the NP in the gen. that occupies the first hemistich (and part of pāda c) remains unresolved until the governing verb, *ápāḥ* 'you have drunk', which opens the second hemistich. The referent of this phrase -- namely soma -- also remains unresolved until the very end of pāda b, with the tip-off *mádhvaḥ* 'of the honey'. (Though initial *mandrásya* 'gladdening' might appear to point to soma, in fact it's far more often used of Agni.)

VI.39.2–4: As noted in the publ. intro. (and see comm. ad VI.38.2–4 above), the three middle verses are marked by repeated use of the near deictic in pāda-initial position, beginning every hemistich but 2cd and coming to a crescendo in vs. 4 with three iterations: *ayám* 2a, *ayám* 3a, *imám* 3c, *ayám* 4a, b, c. The unidentified referent of all these deictic forms is soma — see Old's disc. — but soma at least partially identified with Indra, as the opener of the Vala cave. The repeated use of the deitic, pointing to something in the immediate vicinity of the speaker, focuses on soma as the ritual substance on the sacrificial ground.

The three vss. also share an etymological figure type, with transitive (/causative) verb taking a negated object to the same root: 2c *rujád árugnam*, 3a *dyotayad adyútaḥ*, 4a *rocayad arúcaḥ*. And the presence of the preverb *ví* in pāda-interior in each vs. (2c, 3a, 4b) is another shared feature.

On vss. 3–4 see Hoffmann, Injunk. 142–43.

VI.39.2: The first pāda is truncated, though the frequency of the Vala theme and the stereotyped phraseology associated with it easily allow the missing parts to be supplied. With *páry ádrim usrāḥ* we can add the part. *sántam*, as in IV.1.15 *gāḥ … pári ṣántam ádrim* "… the rock surrounding the cows" (cf. VI.17.5). As for the verb, √*ruj* is the (or a) standard root for this mythological action (cf. nearby VI.32.2 *rujád ádrim*), and *ruját* opening pāda c can serve in the first hemistich as well. (Scar [425] unaccountably supplies "ging" instead.)

The second pāda contains an elementary etymological figure, with the root noun cmpd *ṛtayúj-* flanked by its component parts: *ṛtá(-dhītibhir) ṛtayúg yujānáḥ*. The publ. tr. renders the first cmpd. as "by those of true insight," implying that *ṛtá-* is adjectival, and the second as "the one whose yoke is truth," implying that it is a bahuvrīhi. I would alter this tr. to "the one yoked with truth, having been yoked by those whose insights are truth (that is, the priest/poets)."

The third pāda also contains a simple etymological figure: *rujád árugṇam* "he breaks the unbreakable."

In d Ge, Schmidt (149), and Scar (425) all take *yodhat* as a preterite (e.g., Ge 'bekämpfte'), but I don't see how it can be anything but a root aor. subjunctive (so explicitly Macd. VGS, 410). If this analysis is correct, it makes it likely that the injunc. *ruját* in c also falls in the present/future (or perhaps, in Hoffmann's terms, zeitlos) realm. Note that Hoffmann (Injunk. 142–43) so interprets the following two vss. (3–4), which, as we've seen, pattern closely with vs. 2. Nonetheless the three scholars just mentioned take all of vs. 2 as preterital, whereas I consider this to be an instance of the reconfiguring of mythological deeds as actions we hope to be repeated in the current time.

Old wants to emend *índraḥ* in d to voc. *indra*, to allow soma to be the subject of *yodhat* as it is of the rest of the vs., and he points to this same voc. *indra* at the end of the next hemistich (3b). However, it is hard to see why the first of two identical forms would be redactionally altered to be *different* from the second, and the shifting conceptual boundary between soma and Indra as agents in this sequence makes the transmitted text unproblematic, as Old also admits.

VI.39.3: The identity of *ayám* as soma is fixed by *índuḥ* 'drop' towards the end of b, but not until fairly late in this sequence. The play of *índu-* and *índra-* so prominent in Maṇḍala IX is found here in their adjacency at the end of the hemistich.

VI.39.4: Whether the referent of the 'unshining' (*arúcaḥ*) is the same as that of the 'unlit' (*adyútaḥ*) of 3a, namely the nights (*aktū́n* 3a), is unclear. Hoffmann suggests so, with ?, and I see nothing against it. Both *adyút-* and *arúc-* are hapaxes in the RV, so we can't bring to bear other usages of these words.

Ge (explicitly n. 2b) considers *r̥tayúj-* here as having a different sense from the same cmpd. in vs. 2: "mit dem Recht im Bunde" (2b) versus "mit den rechtzeitig geschirrten Rossen" (4c). Even if *r̥tá-* ever had the sense 'timely, punctual' (which it does not), it is inconceivable to me that in a hymn of this length, the poet would use the same cmpd. in two very different senses, within two vss. of each other and marking the boundaries of an omphalos. Schmidt (149) also considers this unlikely, though he attributes the contrary view to Lüders, who, as far as I can see, doesn't hold it or at least explicitly state it; Scar (425) temporizes in his disc., though he tr. the other three instances of *r̥tayúj-* (incl. our vs. 4), all modifying 'horses', with the anodyne 'wohlgeschirrten', as opposed to our vs. 2, which he renders 'der Verbündete des R̥ta' -- in other words, implicitly following Ge's differentiation. I would alter the publ. tr. from "whose yoke is truth" to "yoked with truth," as in vs. 2.

VI.39.5: Note that there are some echoes of vs. 1 in this final vs. The singer in the dative *gr̥ṇaté* is found in both vss., immediately after the caesura (1d, 5a); *íṣaḥ* 'refreshments' opens the pāda in 1d and 5b; and there is a teasing reflection of pāda-initial *ápā(ḥ)* (1c 'you have drunk') in pāda-initial *apá(ḥ)* (5c 'waters).

VI.40 Indra

VI.40.1: I take *gaṇé* as referring to the troop of Maruts, as often, not an unidentified set of mortals making up a "(Sänger)schar," as Ge seems to take it. Assuming that it refers to the Maruts, this provides conceptual ring composition with the final word of the hymn, *marúdbhiḥ*, as noted in the publ. intro.

VI.40.2: In the 2nd hemistich the series of subjects -- the cows, the men, the waters, and the stone -- detail the various elements, both animate and not, that collaborate to produce the soma: the cows as the milk to be mixed in, the men who perform the pressing and the other ritual actions, the waters that both swell the soma stalk and are mixed with the pressed juices, and the stone used to press the stalks.

As Ge notes (n. 2cd) the final *asmai* has two possible readings: it can double *te* in c, "for you … for that one [=you] to drink," or it can refer to soma, appearing earlier in the clause in the acc. phrase *tám … índum* "this drop." I favor the latter, with dat. *asmai* attracted into the dat. as complement of the dat. infin. *pītáye* (as subj., as in the publ. tr. "for it to be fully drunk," or as obj. with *te* as subj. "for you to drink it fully"). Because the infinitive phrase *pītáye sám asmai* is separated from the rest of the clause and repeats the preverb/adverb *sám*, I favor the former. The use of the near-deictic *asmai* for soma, even unaccented, recalls the insistent *ayám* for soma in the preceding hymn (vss. 2–4; see comm. ad loc.), and it also forms a little ring in this vs., with init. *ásya* (2a) having the same referent as *asmai* at the end of 2d.

VI.40.3: In sandhi the phrase <u>*sutá indra sóma ā́*</u> is completely ambiguous between nom. *sutáḥ … sómaḥ* and loc. *suté … sóme*. The publ. tr. interprets it as the former, while the Pp. reads the latter. Although nothing rides on it, I would now be inclined to follow the Pp., with two parallel loc. absolutes: "with the fire kindled (and) the soma pressed, let your fallow bays …"

VI.40.4: As noted in the publ. intro., *váyo dhāt* here echoes almost the same phrase in 1d *váyo dhāḥ* (both also introduced by pāda-init. *áthā*), but with reciprocal switch of subject and beneficiary: Indra creates vitality for the sacrifice in 1d; the sacrifice does the same for Indra in 4d.

VI.40.5: The disjunctive construction marked by two occurrences of *vā* 'or' describing the possible places where Indra might be contains three non-parallel terms: an adv. *ṛdhak*, a loc. NP *své sádane*, and a dep. clause with locatival subordinator *yátra … ási*. It is also a nice instance of Behagel's Law.

A verb of motion has to be supplied in c, but this is amply anticipated by *ā́ yāhi* in 3d and 4a. Assuming this impv. should be supplied in c, it rhymes with *pāhi* in d.

VI.41 Indra

VI.41.2: I take *váriṣṭhā* as a likely pun, not only 'widest' (hence a throat that can accommodate a lot of soma at one gulp), but also 'best'; cf. disc. ad VI.37.4.

For *prá √ sthā* with soma as expressed or implied obj., cf. I.15.9, VII.92.2, and, with *prásthitam*, II.36.4, 37.2.

I do not know the exact semantic nuance of *sám √ vṛt*, but I think it must mean something more than Ge's "mitkommen." I take it here as purposive 'turn oneself to', with *gavyúḥ* expressing the purpose, but this may be pushing the idiom.

VI.41.3: Note that the equational sentence ending d, *yás te ánnam*, does not show gender attraction between subj. and pred., as in later Vedic prose.

VI.42 Indra

An uninsistent play on preverbs structures this hymn. *práti* appears with 3 different verbs in the 1ˢᵗ 3 vss.: *práti … bhara* 1ab, *pratyétana* 2a, *prati bhūṣatha* 3b, while in the last vs. the *práti … bhara* of vs. 1 is replaced by the more usual presentation verb *prá bhara* (4b).

VI.42.2: As sometimes elsewhere (I.9.2, VIII.1.17, X.32.8), *enam* doubles *īm* in the phrase *ém* (that is, *ắ + īm*) *enam*, a pile-up of two acc. enclitics, whose referent is postponed till the end of the hemistich, *somapắtamam*. On this sequence see my RVic *sīm* and *īm* (2002), 302–3 and n. 18.

There is no obvious reason for the accent on *pratyétana* (Pp. *praty étana*). (Old's [ZDMG 60: 732] ref. is barely a mention and provides no real explanation.) The assumption about *étana* is that it is a 2ⁿᵈ pl. impv. of the root pres. of *√ i*, with unexpected full grade of the root, unexpected verb accent in a main clause, and unexpected root rather than ending accent (versus *itá*, though of course the full grade would account for the root accent). I think rather that it should be analyzed *ắ-itana*, with accented preverb contracted with the unaccented expected zero-grade root syllable of the verb. We would thus have an unaccented verb as expected in this apparent main clause. But this suggestion raises two problems: 1) when two preverbs precede an unaccented verb, they should both be accented (though most the exx. I have identified have verbal material between the 1ˢᵗ and 2ⁿᵈ preverbs), e.g., IV.4.4 *práty ắ tanuṣva*, and we should therefore expect accented **práty* here as well; 2) *ắ* is already present pāda-initially in *ém*. Balanced against these problems is the fact that *ắ* is usually the 2ⁿᵈ preverb in a complex (see *práty-ắ √ tan* just cited), and the assumed *ắ (…) práti* would be quite unusual (almost no such sequences registered in MonWms). I think we must assume that, more or less simultaneously, *ắ* was doubled to serve as clitic host to *īm* in the frozen sequence *ém enam*, besides immediately preceding the verb, and that *étana* was reinterpr. as simply a full-grade accented impv. (cf. unaccented *etana* in V.61.4, on which see comm. ad loc.), not as containing a preverb — which reinterpretation then induced loss of accent on **práti*. The doubling of *ắ* is somewhat like the doubling of preverbs sometimes found in the Gāthās, though there that seems to be a redactional change.

VI.42.3: I take *yádī* as representing *yád ī* with the enclitic acc. *ī*, parallel to *īm* in the last vs. Note that *ī* here is pre-C, while *īm* in 2a is pre-V.

As Ge notes (n. 3cd) there is some uncertainty about the subj. and goal of the verbs here -- Indra or Soma. I take the subject in both cases to be Indra. In c *védā víśvasya* "he knows of it all" echoes 1b *víśvāni vidúṣe* "to the one who knows all things," an unequivocal ref. to Indra. I think there is a contrast between c and d of a familiar type: Indra *could* go to any soma ritual ("knows of it all") but comes just to our soma (*táṃ-tam íd*).

VI.42.4: The āmreḍita pronoun *táṃ-tam íd* referring to soma in 3d is then contrasted with another pronominal āmreḍita, *asmā-asmā íd*, referring to Indra; the near deictic announces him as having arrived at the ritual ground, to which he was hastening in 3d.

On the surprising last hemistich, see publ. intro.

VI.43 Indra

VI.43.2: As Ge points out, this must be a ref. to the three soma-pressings: the "middle and end" are respectively the Midday Pressing and the Third Pressing; the "sharp-pressed" refers to the freshly pressed soma of the Morning Pressing, which must be especially pungent.

VI.43.4: The HvN ed. unaccountably omits this vs.

VI.44 Indra

VI.44.1–3: In the refrain of pādas cd, the position of *sá* and of the unaccented elements *indra te* strongly suggests that the clause begins in the middle of c -- or rather that *sómaḥ sutáḥ* has been extraclausally topicalized. Although in vss. 1–2 this nom. phrase could belong to the rel. clause of ab, that prospect is foreclosed in vs. 3, because soma is represented in the rel. cl. of 3ab by the instr. *yéna*.

I do not understand why this refrain contains an overt form of the copula *ásti*. Outside of dependent clauses, overt *asti* is generally an existential, but that function is highly unlikely here.

In addition to the refrain that unifies all three vss. of this tṛca, the three vss. are structured by rel. clauses in ab with soma as the referent of the rel. prn.

VI.44.3: This vs. subtly undermines the autonomous power of Indra. In the refrain of all three vss. Indra is addressed as *svadhāpate* 'lord of independent power', but here in the first hemistich Indra is said to be *like* (*ná*) "one grown strong by (his own) power," *like* "one overpowering by *his own* forms of help" (*svā́bhir ūtíbhih*). In other words the power that appears to be Indra's own (*svá-*) is really produced for him by soma.

VI.44.4–6: Although this tṛca does not have glaring signs of unity, it particularly concerns the songs that strengthen Indra and rouse his aid to us. It also has a subtle morphological ring; see the disc. of the loc. inf. in 3d.

VI.44.4: On *áprahan-* (or, less likely, *áprahaṇa-*), see Old, Scar (689). Scar construes *vaḥ* with this form ("der nicht auf euch einschlägt") as well as with *gṛṇīṣé* ("… will ich für euch preisen"). I take *vaḥ* only with *gṛṇīṣé* and supply 'us' with the root noun cmpd.; Ge likewise takes *vaḥ* with the verb and supplies "keiner" as obj. of the cmpd. There is no way to choose and no reason to do so, since all three are more or less equivalent: Indra is all powerful but does not threaten the community to which the poet belongs.

VI.44.5: The *íd* in pāda a seems displaced: we would expect *yám íd …*, though that order would produce a choppy meter. The *íd* in c is better positioned, though we actually might expect it to be limiting *asya*, not the *tám* anticipating *śúṣmam*. The publ. tr. does not render either *íd*; if I were to do so, the result would be "(It's) just (him) whom the songs make strong … just his tempestuous force that the world-halves respect."

VI.44.6: This vs. is syntactically more complex and ritually more technical than the other two vss. in this tṛca.
 The most noteworthy form is the loc. inf. *upastṛṇīṣáni*, a hapax, not surprisingly. In my opinion it is possible to account for the creation of this form from context, albeit indirectly. The first vs. of this tṛca contains the well-attested 1ˢᵗ sg. *gṛṇīṣé* (4b), belonging to the tight class of *-sé* 1ˢᵗ sgs. in the 'praise/sing' semantic sphere. Beside *gṛṇīṣé* there exists a *-ṣáni* infinitive *gṛṇīṣáni* (2x, incl. once in this maṇḍala, VI.15.6). I think our poet built *upastṛṇīṣáni* on the model of this *gṛṇīṣáni*, as a partial echo of *gṛṇīṣé* in 4b, based on the existence of 9ᵗʰ class presents to both of these roots. Because it echoes that 1ˢᵗ sg. I interpr. the predicated inf. with 1ˢᵗ ps. ref. ("it [is mine] to lay …"). Once again, as in 4, the *vaḥ* refers to the poet's fellow officiants.
 In the ritual the 'underlayer' is the layer of butter spread on the ladle underneath the principal offering. Here it is used in a doubly metaphorical sense: the underlayer for Indra could presumably be configured physically as the barhis on which he would sit, but at another metaphorical remove it could refer to the recitations that provide him with a figurative foundation.
 The poet then, by a clever trick, mobilizes this underlayer of words to serve as a metaphor for the multiplication of Indra's forms of help for us. This is accomplished by means of a simile: *vípo ná … ūtáyaḥ* "forms of help like inspired words," thus implicitly equating the two. These *vípaḥ* 'inspired words' (not, with Ge, 'fingers') are ours, in fact the very *ukthá-* found in pāda a, dependent on *barháṇā*. The connection between the two is suggested by the phrase *barháṇā vipáḥ* "by the power of inspired speech" in VIII.63.7 (*vipáḥ* there is gen. sg., as opposed to our nom. pl. *vípaḥ*, as the accent shows). In cd the poet asserts that like our hymns, which rise to Indra, spreading from their position as interconnected (*sakṣítaḥ* 'dwelling together') underlayer, his forms of help will similarly grow up and out. On this vs. see also Scar (97).

VI.44.7–9: On the meter of this tṛca see Old, Proleg. 91 and HvN metrical comm. The fading in and out between Virāj and Triṣṭubh is further complicated by the openings of 3 in 11-syllable lines in 7b, c.
 The tṛca concerns soma and contains lexical and thematic responsions.

VI.44.7: The medial pf. part. *papāná-* is one of only 3 forms of the middle pf. in the RV, 2 of which, incl. this one, are used passively. See Kü (309). Note that a deriv. of the other root √*pā* 'protect', *pāyúḥ*, is found in the 2nd hemistich.

The vs. is notable for a number of hapaxes: *acait*, *staulắ-*, and *dhautárī*, the latter two also marked by vṛddhi.

On *acait* as a nonce *s*-aor. to √*cit* 'perceive', see Narten (114).

staulắ- here is reminiscent of the likewise impenetrable *staunắ-* in this same maṇḍala VI.66.5. No remotely credible guesses have been proposed for these forms, or for *dhautárī-*; Ge (n. 7c): "ganz dunkel" and he fails to tr. the NP; Old: "Über *staulắbhir dhautárībhiḥ* scheint kein Ergebnis erreichbar"; EWA (II.762 and I.783) also throws up its hands. I am inclined to connect *staulắ-* and *staunắ-* with similar words but with aspirated initial *sth-*, namely *sthūrá-* 'brawny, sturdy' and *sthūṇā-* 'post' (see comm. ad VI.66.5) respectively, but I cannot explain the phonological discrepancy.

As for *dhautárī-*, Old tentatively suggests that it might belong with one of the roots √*dhāv* 'run' or 'rinse'. For translational convenience I have assumed the former, but without any conviction. In any case the striking double vṛddhi *-au-* of these paired nominals must be meant to draw attention to the phrase.

VI.44.8: The passive interpr. of the pf. part. *papāná-* in 7b is affirmed by the pass. aor. *apāyi* in 8a.

Similarly, the second pāda clarifies the sense of 7b, where it was said that soma "has perceived what is better for the gods." What is better seems to be the gods' intent, announced here in 8b, to achieve glory. The VP *mánas* √*kṛ* generally means 'set one's mind on/to'; cf. V.61.7, I.54.9, II.26.2=VIII.19.20 (though V.30.4 and X.117.2 are outliers).

The forms grouped by Gr under a stem *mahás-*, an adj. meaning 'gross', generally have other interpr., either adverbial or belonging to a diff. stem (e.g., gen. sg. to *máh-*). Although a suffix-accented adj. *mahás-* built by accent shift to neut. *máhas-* 'greatness' would fit the standard pattern (type *yáśas-* 'glory' → *yaśás-* 'glorious'), the realization of the pattern in this lexical item seems to have been rare to non-existent. In this passage most (Gr, Ge) do take *maháḥ* as a neut. adj. to this stem, modifying *nắma* ("acquiring a great name"), but because of the general avoidance of such an adj. I prefer to take *maháḥ* as the masc. nom. sg. to *mahá-*, a quotation of the name he received.

In keeping with the interpr. of the root √*ven* as 'track, trace, seek', I interpr. its grdv. *venyá-*, when not a PN, as '(worthy) to be tracked/sought'.

VI.44.9: This tṛca-final vs. reprises and repurposes some of the statements in the opening vs. 7. The skill (*dákṣa-*) that Soma found in 7a we ask him to bestow on us in 9a. Soma, "having won" (*sasavān*) in 7c, is asked to help us in winning (*sātaú … aviḍḍhi*) in 9d. Unfortunately nothing in 9 sheds light on the problematic instr. phrase in 7c.

VI.44.10-12: This tṛca foresees various disasters and tribulations and asks Indra for his help in combatting them.

VI.44.10: I am not sure of the exact nuance of √*bhū* + DAT. Gr takes it as meaning 'angehören, eigen sein', with a rare dat. here, instead of the gen. usual in this idiom (his no. 13). Ge renders it thus ("dir … haben wir uns zu eigen gegeben"). Even with the gen., Gr identifies very few passage with this value, and most of these should be otherwise interpr., and I also wonder about an augmented aor. in such a sense. The publ. tr. is by contrast "we have become ready for you," and I think something like this is the intention (perhaps "we are here for you"). We are awaiting his advent at the ritual and the generosity he will display there, but there is some worry that he will fail to show up, as the 2ⁿᵈ clause of the 1ˢᵗ hemistich shows.

Note that the fairly rare root √*ven* appears here soon after the appearance of its deriv. *venyá-* in 8d. It is possible that this lexical association led to the grafting of this tṛca onto the previous one in this loose collection of short hymns.

VI.44.11: On *niṣṣídh-* see comm. ad III.51.5.

VI.44.12: The morphological identity and syntactic function of *maghónaḥ* in d are unclear. See esp. Old's disc. It can be either acc. pl. or gen.-abl. sg. (or an irregular nom. pl., a possibility that Old considers and dismisses). The problem is that in neither case would it form part of a standard construction with the verb *ā* √*dabh*. Ge (n. 12d) thinks of a double acc.: "trick (our) benefactors out of you" -- that is, the non-giving ones might scare Indra off from our sacrifice or get their invitation to him first, thereby depriving our maghavans of Indra's presence. This certainly conforms to a regular worry that sacrificers express, but the construction is unprecedented. Old opts for the abl. sg. The purport of his interpr. is essentially the same as Ge's: that the non-givers not trick Indra *away from* (abl.) the maghavan, which he sees as our human patron. The publ. tr. follows Old, though it might be clearer if it were "… not trick you away from (our) benefactor." Although this construction is also unprecedented, adding an oblique complement to a transitive construction seems less radical to me than investing it with a second acc. However, I now see another problem with the Old solution: the tṛca opens with a voc. *maghavan* addressed to Indra (10a), so it might be odd to have another sg. form of this stem referring to a human. And I don't see how to construe an abl. *maghónaḥ* referring to Indra in the same construction that contains an acc. *tvā* with the same reference. Nevertheless, I still favor Old's interpr. and simply allow for this shift of reference; such a shift from divine to human is also necessary if the form is taken as plural, with Ge. There is another possibility, raised and dismissed by Old, that *maghónaḥ* is in fact acc. pl., but the two acc. are conjoined: "mögen nicht die Nichtgeber dich betrügen (und) die Spender." This is not outside the realm of possibility.

VI.44.13–15: Another soma tṛca.

VI.44.13: The first hemistich contains disharmony of number in a constructio ad sensum: The priest is urged to offer of the pressed (soma-drink)s in the plural (*sutānām*); the reason for this is immediately given in the 2ⁿᵈ part of pāda b, *sá hy àsya rājā* "for he is its king." Unaccented singular *asya* presupposes a referent already in the discourse, with "it" referring to soma, represented in the previous clause as a plural. The singular is then continued in the

rest of the tṛca (*asyá* 14a, *tám … sómam* 14cd, *sutám … sómam* 15a, with sg. *sutám* picking up pl. *sutắnām* of 13a).

VI.44.14: As Ge point out (n. 14a), the "many shapes" (*purú várpāṃsi*) that Indra knows could either be his own (given his penchant for shape-shifting) or those of the various demonic enemies he destroys. I assume that the poet meant to leave it ambiguous, though it's worth noting that the one instance of the bahuvrīhi *puru-várpas-* refers to Indra (though in the late hymn X.120.6).

     The hapax *-si* impv. *hoṣi* has no structural support in the RV, the only aor. attested being the pass. aor. *áhāvi*. However, an act. *s*-aor. is reasonably well attested in Vedic prose, beginning with the BYV Saṃhitās (*ahauṣīt*, etc.); see Narten (Sig.Aor. 288). It is difficult to know whether *yoṣi* is indirect evidence for a *s*-aor. subjunctive to this aor., *hoṣat, etc., to which *hoṣi* would ultimately belong, or whether it was created as a nonce beside the other *-si* impvs. in this ritual sphere such as *yákṣi*, *mátsi* and has nothing to do with the aor. forms in prose. I weakly favor the latter explanation.

VI.44.15: The vs. is characterized by three root-accented agent nouns (*pắtā* a, *hántā* b, *gántā* c), all pāda-initial, all with acc. obj./goal. Then in d the pattern is switched: a suffix-accented agent noun (*avitắ*), interior in its pāda (immed. after caesura) with (objective) gen. complement. All of them are presumably predicates of *astu* in pāda a. I consider this simply an instance of the RVic tendency to shake up established patterns; I doubt that the poet is attempting to draw a distinction between Indra's habitual roles as drinker, smiter, and goer, in contrast to a situational role as helper, as Tichy claims (*Die Nomen agentis auf* -tar- *im Vedischen*, 298–99; cf. 257 and passim). Among other things, "help" is one of the most frequent things we ask Indra to do for us; it is surely one of his standard, habitual roles. It happens that there is no root-accented **ávitar-*, though *avitár-* is extremely common, and so no such form was available to match the first three *-tar-* stems in this vs. I do not know if the gap is accidental or systemic.

     Note that *kārúdhāyas-*, a rare bv., reappears here from 12 -- again, a possible reason for attaching this tṛca to the preceding one.

VI.44.16–18: Here the power of soma to rouse Indra to beneficial action is the general subject of the tṛca. The three forms belonging to √*pā* 'drink' in the 1st hemistich, *pắtram* 'drinking cup', *indrapắnam* 'giving drink to Indra', and *apāyi* 'has been drunk', in echoing the first word of the preceding vs. (15a *pắtā* 'drinker'), may have caused this tṛca to be grafted onto the last.

VI.44.16: Ge takes *índrasya* as agent of *apāyi* ("Indra hat seinen lieben Göttertrank getrunken"), but finite passives, even verbs of consumption, don't take genitive agents.

VI.44.17–18: These two vss. contain two exx. of unexpectedly accented 2nd sg. impvs.: 17a *jahí* and 18d *kṛṇuhí*, both internal to the pāda and preceded by material belonging to the same clause. Old cites both (in a list of other puzzling passages; ZDMG 60: 736), but provides no real explanation. In both cases it is possible to construct ad hoc justifications.

For the *jahí* of 17a, note that 17d also contains an accented form of this same impv. (though with metrically lengthened final) in the sequence *prá mṛṇā jahī ca*, where *jahī* contrasts with the immediately preceding impv. *prá mṛṇā* and has its accent honestly, as it were. It could be that *jahí* in pāda a received the accent redactionally or as a poetic imitation of the *jahī* later in the vs. As for *kṛṇuhí* in 18d, it might be taken as contrastive with the (rather distant) imperativally used injunctive *kaḥ* at the end of b to the same root; however, they are not used in the same idiom. It's also worth noting that *kṛṇuhí* is followed by particles that ordinarily take 2nd position in a clause (*smā no*), and so *kṛṇuhí* by default appears to be in 1st position. And both 17a *jahí* and 18d *kṛṇuhí* are right after the caesura. But none of these explanations seems sufficient -- e.g., post-caesura position does not induce accent on verbs -- and I think we must consider these two exx. as peculiarities of the composer of this tṛca.

VI.44.17: The object phrase in the 1st hemistich provides an ex. of number disharmony (of a different type from that in vs. 13). The main objects of Indra's smiting are "rivals (and) foes," the pl. phrase *śátrūn … amítrān*, but they are further specified as "kin and non-kin," *jāmím ájāmim*, in the singular. The same disharmony is found in IV.4.5 *jāmím ájāmim … śátrūn*, where the *śátrūn* that closes our pāda a substitutes for *amítrān*.

VI.44.18: For the idiom in *sūrī́n kṛṇuhí … ardhám*, cf. II.30.5 *asmā́n ardhám kṛṇutāt*.

VI.44.19–21: This tṛca has a more obvious unifying feature than the last several: the repeated 'bull' words, *vṛ́ṣan-* and *vṛṣabhá-*. I count 16 exx. of the two stems in the three vss. The bull(ish) grammatical subjects of the three vss. are different: 19 Indra's horses, 20 the soma drinks, 21 Indra himself. The *vṛ́ṣan-* stem predominates; *vṛṣabhá-* only appears beginning in the last pāda of 20 (though prepared for by instr. pl. *vṛ́ṣabhiḥ* in 20c). I do not see any appreciable difference in their usage; note the coreferential dative *vṛ́ṣṇe … vṛṣabhā́ya* in 20d and, even more striking, the use of the two stems in strictly parallel expressions in 21a and b: *vṛ́ṣā … divó vṛṣabháḥ pṛthivyā́ḥ* "the bull of heaven, the bull of earth" and *vṛ́ṣā síndhūnāṃ vṛṣabhá stíyānām* "the bull of the rivers and the bull of the standing waters." Nonetheless, Ge carefully distinguishes them, with Bull reserved for *vṛṣabhá-* and *vṛ́ṣan-* rendered as Riese / riesig 'giant'. But I very much doubt if the intent was "you are the giant of heaven, the bull of the earth," etc.
    The concentration on the bull words leaves little room or energy for other poetic flourishes.

VI.44.20: Although they belong to different, and distant, tṛcas, the partitive gen. construction here, … *prá … sutā́nām*, DAT *bharanti …*, matches that in vs. 13: … *prá … sutā́nām*, DAT *bhara …* and occupies the same position in the vs., though in our vs. √*bhṛ* also has a direct acc. object *sómam*.

VI.44.21: Given the parallelism of the phrase *vṛ́ṣā síndhūnāṃ vṛṣabhá stíyānām*, it is clear that the gen. pl. *stíyānām* must be in semantic complementarity with *síndhūnām* 'of the rivers'. Almost the same pair is found in VII.5.2, with a substitution for the first nom.: *netā́ síndhūnāṃ vṛṣabhá stíyānām*. Gr glosses *stíyā-* 'Schneefeld, Gletscher', but, given the

relative lack of attention to snow and the like in the RV once the Indo-Aryans had left the high mountains mostly behind, some other type of water contrasting with rivers seems more likely -- with Ge's "der stehenden Gewässer" a likely alternative (cf. also Lüders, Varuṇa I.144). Re's "eaux-stagnantes" (EVP XIII.56 and 141), though expressing a similar contrast, is less appealing because of the negative implication of "stagnant waters": would Indra really want to be their bull? The question then is what the form is derived from; EWA classifies it with the root √styā 'be stiff', of limited attestation in Skt. but found also in MIA, which seems reasonable. However, I am tempted to see a primary or secondary association with √sthā 'stand', since forms of this root (with the sense 'stand *still*') can be used of waters. Cf., e.g., the famous phrase describiing the rushing of the waters freed by Indra in the Vṛtra battle in I.32.10 átiṣṭhantīnām "of those (waters) not standing still." Re (EVP XIII.141) in a lapidary comment -- "fait comme *díya-*" -- seems to hint at a direct derivation (*díya-* to √*dā*, then *stíya-* to √*sthā*) without pursuing it, and Lub (*System*, 104) tentatively suggests that it belongs to an *-i*-enlarged form of √**steh₂*, viz. **steh₂-i-*, but doesn't further spell out the details. The trick of course is to keep the laryngeal from aspirating the *t*; if we start with Lub's root, the zero-grade **sth₂-i-* would presumably metathesize to **stih₂* (as with √*pā(y)* 'drink': *pītá-*), which would yield *stiy-* before a vowel. But I have no commitment to such an analysis. In any case it is impossible to tell whether the form belongs to a short or a long *a/ā* stem, since it only shows up in the gen. pl.

VI.44.22–24: As noted in the publ. intro., repetition also characterizes this tṛca: the *ayám* that opens every hemistich, along with two other pādas (23b, 24b). In all instances the referent is Soma, whose name, however, does not appear until the opening of the last pāda, 24d (though the reliable synonym *índu-* 'drop' is found in 22d). The beginning of the first vs., 22a, identifies the subject as a god (*ayáṃ deváḥ*), and the tṛca attributes powerful agency to him, including deeds generally associated with Indra, such as the defeat of the Paṇi (22b), the placing of light in the sun (23b), and the propping apart of the two worlds (24a). It is only the specification of Indra (in an oblique case) as the "yokemate" of "this god" early in the tṛca (22b *índreṇa yujā́*) that prevents the audience from assuming that *ayáṃ deváḥ* refers to Indra (who is, after all, the dedicand of the hymn). Nonetheless, the virtual identification of Soma with Indra is clear.

VI.44.22: As just noted, *índuḥ* 'drop' opening pāda b firmly identifies the subject as Soma, but the common word play between phonologically similar *índu-* and *índra-*, found esp. in Maṇḍala IX, underlines the permeable boundary just noted between Indra and Soma in this tṛca.
      The brief narrative allusion in pāda c ("stole the weapons of his own father") sounds like a fractured version of the just-born Indra stealing the soma from Tvaṣṭar, but it is hard to know how to square that tale with this formulation.

VI.44.23: As Ge points out (n. 23cd), in the 2ⁿᵈ hemistich Soma the god is differentiated from soma the drink, with the god finding the distant, hidden drink.
      tritéṣu is the only pl. form to this stem in the RV, and it is not at all clear what it is doing here. Ge takes it as the PN Trita, with the pl. referring to Trita and his brothers,

among whom Soma (the god) finds soma (the drink). But I know of no such narrative, and Ge does not cite one. I take the form instead as representing the older adj. 'third' (see EWA s.v.), the older correspondent of *tṛtīya-* 'third' (which, of course, is also old, having Iranian cognates). As is well known, there are three heavens, and I take the "third realms of light" to be the third or highest heaven, here in the pl. because it is conceived of as further subdivided. For soma as resident in the third heaven, see K. Klaus, *Die altindische Kosmologie*, 175 with n. 66. It is possible (but only *possible*) that the vs. implicitly depicts the three heavens, with the dawns in the nearer one, the sun in the middle, and the soma in the third.

The drink is threefold presumably because of the three pressings of the soma sacrifice.

VI.44.24: *(ví) ṣkabhāyat* echoes *astabhāyat* in the first vs. of the tṛca (22b).

I will not speculate on the numerology in *saptáraśmi-* 'having seven reins' and *daśayantra-* 'having ten fastenings', whose referents may be ritual or cosmological, or (most likely) both.

VI.45 Indra

This hymn contains 5 instances of the phrase "the stake (that is) set," *hitá- dhána-*: 3 acc. sg. *hitáṃ dhánam* (2c, 12c, 15c), 2 loc. sg. (11b, 13b). All but one of these has the order just given, but one of the loc. exx. (13b) is found in the opposite order, as *dháne hité* as opposed to 11b *hité dháne*, which matches the order of the accusatives. A survey of the other examples of the phrase in the RV turns up one more ex. of the acc. *hitáṃ dhánam* (VIII.80.8), but a number of further loc. exx., almost all of which have the flipped order found in 13b *dháne hité* (I.40.2=VI.61.5, I.116.15, I.132.5, VIII.3.9, IX.53.2) versus *hité dháne* (X.63.14). There is only one ex. of the phrase outside of the acc. sg. and loc. sg., namely *dháneṣu hitéṣu* (VIII.16.5). It thus appears that the acc. and loc. exx. have different underlying orders. Since the word order in this phrase, in both acc. and loc., is, at least to the naked eye, metrically indifferent (always ⏑ – ⏑ –), it is hard to see what is driving the variable order, esp. since almost all instantiations of this phrase are pāda-final (except for I.116.15 and 132.5). Within this very limited data set, it would be possible to assume that the variant order signals different syntactic intentions: "the set stake" (acc.) as opposed to the loc. absol. "when the stake (is/was) set," with secondary predication. Dieter Gunkel (pers. comm.) tells me that he produced a similar (independent) hypothesis when investigating "swappable bigrams" with Kevin Ryan (some of which results were presented in Vienna, June 24, 2015). However, given the vagaries of RVic word order, it is difficult to know if such a hypothesis would hold up across a large set of data. It would be useful to investigate word order in clear loc. absolutes.

VI.45.3: I have silently suppressed the plurals in *práṇītayaḥ* and *ūtáyaḥ* (guidance and help, rather than guidances and helps). Given that *práṇītayaḥ* reprises *ānayat … súnītī* in the 1st vs. of the tṛca, it might be better to translate it as "Great is his leading."

The three *-ti*-stem abstracts *práṇīti-*, *práśasti-*, and *ūtí-* recall *súnīti-* in 1b.

VI.45.4: As was implied in the publ. tr., there is more cohesion across tṛcas than within them. In this 1st vs. of the 2nd tṛca there are a number of connections to the previous one: the 1st word *sákhāyaḥ* recalls *sákhā* in 1c; in b the impv. *prá … gāyata* "sing forth" is a variant of the nominal form *práśasti-* (3b) to the lexeme *prá √ śaṃs* 'proclaim forth'; in c the nominal clause *sá hí naḥ* X resembles 1c … *sá naḥ* X; c contains another *-ti-*stem abstract, *prámati-*, like those in 3 (two of which are cmpded with *prá-*); and the final word of the vs., *mahī́*, echoes the 1st word of 3 *mahī́ḥ*.

VI.45.5: The sequence *ékasya … dváyoḥ … / utédṛśe yáthā vayám* "of one, of two and for such as we are" is a nice example of Behagel's Law. It also shows variant syntax in a conjoined construction, since the third conjoined member is dative (*īdṛśe*), while the first two are gen. (unless *dváyoḥ* is loc., which seems unlikely). The result, at least in translation, is almost awkward, but the formal switch in case (and number) has semantic consequences, in my opinon. The sequence first presents itself as a purely numerical one (cf. Klein DGRV I.332–33), and we might expect "of one, of two, and *of however many* we are." But the sg. *īdṛśe* changes the focus from the quantity of the beneficiaries to their quality ("such as we," in implicit contrast to people outside our circle of lesser value), and the dative emphasizes the benefactive nature of Indra's actions. Ge's "auch für einen solchen, wie wir sind" misses the point, in my view.

VI.45.6: I supply 'us' as obj. in both a and b, adapted from 4c and esp. 5c; Ge supplies "Männer" (in b), presumably on the basis of *nṛbhiḥ* in c. Either will work, but 'us' seems to provide more continuity.
       náyasi in a connects across tṛcas with *ā́nayat* in 1a, and *ukthaśaṃsínaḥ* in b with *práśastayaḥ* in 3b. In 3b Indra is said to have many *práśasti-*, and here the producers of these *(prá)śasti-* are identified (as us or, with Ge, men).

VI.45.7: More cross-tṛca connections: *bráhma-vāhas-* 7a/4a, *sákhi-* 7b/1c/4a.

VI.45.8: Ge takes *ūcuḥ* to √ *vac* and supplies *hitāni* with *ní*: "In dessen Händen … alle Güter, wie man sagt, nieder(gelegt sind)," but Old's view, that *ūcuḥ* belongs to √*uc*, which regularly takes the preverb *ní* in the meaning 'be accustomed to, be at home in', is preferable. (And in fact Ge admits as much in n. 8a.)

VI.45.9: This vs. contains two parallel direct objects ("strongholds" and "tricks") in two parallel clauses, which presuppose the same verb. The preverb (*ví*) is given at the beginning of pāda a, the verb (*vṛhá*) itself at the beginning of the 2nd hemistich; they must be assembled to produce the full lexeme.

VI.45.10–11: These vss. form a syntactic pair characterized by simple enjambment. Both vss. begin *tám u tvā*, with the iteration of this phrase in 11a still part of the main clause of vs. 10 (and the object of 10c *áhūmahi*). The rest of the first hemistich of 11 consists of two rel. clauses, whose predicate (the predicate for both clauses), *hávyaḥ*, is found at the beginning of c. The rest of c is a separate impv. clause. Although the content of these two

vss. is banal in the extreme, the syncopated effect produced by having the syntactic units not conform to metrical units gives it a bit of oomph. The vs. pair is unified by the 'call' motif: 10c *áhūmahi* 'we have called upon', 11c *hávyaḥ* 'to be called upon' / *hávam* 'call'. The root √*śru* also provides unity: 10c *śravasyávaḥ* 'seeking fame', 11c *śrudhī* 'hear', also, in 12b *śravā̆yyān* 'worthy of fame'.

VI.45.10: After the opening *tám u tvā*, the rest of the hemistich consists only of vocc. *satya somapā, índra vājānām pate*, with only a single accent among them: *índra* is accented because it's initial in its pāda, while the gen. pl. *vājānām* is unaccented because it's part of a voc. phrase. Note that in the HvN ed. *vājānā̆m* bears an impossible, final-syllable accent, a typo that should be deleted.

VI.45.11: It is worth noting that in the temporally contrastive rel. clauses (a: *purā̆* 'previously', b: *nūnám* 'now') whose joint predicate is the grdv. *hávyaḥ* (see above), the one with past reference has an overt copula, pf. *ā̆sitha*, while the one with current reference has the copula gapped.

VI.45.12: The phrase *hitá- dhána-* is repeated from 11b and also picks up the same phrase in 2c. (See disc. above.) In fact 12c *tváyā jeṣma hitáṃ dhánam* is a telling variant on 2c *índro jétā hitáṃ dhánam*. In vs. 2 Indra is described as a/the (habitual) winner of the stake, while by vs. 12 it is we who hope to be the winners with his help. The vocalism of the precative *jeṣma* matches that of the agent noun *jétā* in 2. See further 15c. Note also that 2b contains an instr. *árvatā* "with a steed" (in that case an unsatisfactory one) like *árvadbhiḥ* in 12a.

　　　The opening of the vs. is called "stark elliptisch" by Ge, who sees two different possible constructions (n. 12a): "with insights (might we overcome) (the insights of other poets) and with steeds (might we overcome) steeds" or "with insights (as) steeds …" His tr. seems to reflect the first (though without supplying any further material), while I prefer the second.

VI.45.13: The new tṛca opens with yet another example of the 'stake' phrase, this time in opposite order (*dháne hité*). For further on the order in this phrase, see the above intro. comm. to the hymn.

VI.45.14: The subjunctive *ásati* was omitted in tr.: the first line should read "Your help that will have …"

VI.45.15: The VP √*ji hitáṃ dhánam* returns from 2c and 12c, with two instances of √*ji*: *jéṣi jiṣṇo hitáṃ dhánam*. Here the subject is Indra as in 2c, not 'we' (12c), but he is making use of *our* (*asmā̆kena*) chariot.

VI.45.16: As Old notes (though not in those terms), we seem to have an embedded *main* clause here -- in that *tám u stuhi* forming the second part of pāda a interrupts the rel. cl. that begins the vs. (*yá éka íd*) and continues through the rest of b and c, with the accented verb

jajñé in c. Since *yá éka íd* is in fact only a single constituent, it might be best to consider it fronted around the brief main cl.

VI.45.18: The precative perfect *sāsahīṣṭhāḥ* is striking.

VI.45.19–20: These two vss. contain superlatives to bahuvrīhi *s*-stems that appear earlier in the simplex: 19c *bráhma-vāhastamam*: 4a *bráhma-vāhase*; 20c *gír-vanastamaḥ*: 13a *girvanaḥ* (also 28b).

VI.45.21: Ge takes *niyúdbhiḥ* and *vājebhiḥ* as parallel, and therefore the 'teams' are among the things with which Indra fulfills our desire. Given the position of *niyúdbhiḥ* in the 1ˢᵗ pāda and its usual usage, I think it rather refers to Indra's teams, with which he travels 'here', and I take *ā́* both with *pṛṇa* and with a verb of motion to be supplied. For a similar use, see VI.22.11 *sá no niyúdbhiḥ … ā́ gahi …*, also addressed to Indra in this cycle.

VI.45.22–24: This tṛca concerns itself with cows, picking up *gómadbhir gopate* from the end of the preceding tṛca (21c). In particular 23b *vā́jasya gómataḥ* "prize of cows" reprises 21bc *vājebhiḥ … gómadbhiḥ* and is then echoed by *vrajáṃ gómantam* "enclosure of cows" in 24ab.

VI.45.22: The first pāda contains the common locution in which a poet addresses himself in the sg., but makes a nod to his ritual colleagues in the 2ⁿᵈ pl.: *tád vo gāya*. Lit. this should be "Sing (o poet=me) this, (on behalf of) you all (=priests)." See my "Poetic Self-Reference in the *Rig Veda* and the Persona of Zarathustra" (Fs. Skjaervø, BAI 19 [2005]), where this passage is disc. p. 69. The effort to introduce the 2ⁿᵈ pl. into the English would overbalance the tr., in a way that the slender enclitic *vaḥ* does not.

The simile in c is somewhat unsettling: "Sing what is weal for the able one as if for a cow." Presumably it's not the song that would be weal for a/the cow. Sāy.'s explan., reported by Ge (n. 22c), may well be correct: "as (fodder is) for a cow." Recall also 7c *gā́ṃ ná dóhase huve* "I call upon (Indra) like a cow for milking," where the cow simile is filled out. In light of this passage it may be that here what is weal for the cow is not fodder but rather the call to be milked, which would better resemble the song that is weal for Indra: "Sing what is weal for the able one, as (a milking call) is for a cow."

VI.45.24: There is some difference of opinion on the source of the apparent indefinite *kuvítsa-*, a hapax. Ge (n. 24a) asserts that *sasya* is the gen. corresponding to *sásmin*, enclitic after *kuvíd* (presumably presupposing a notional word space *kuvít sasya*). But the standard opinion, already registered by Gr (< BR; see also explicitly AiG II.1.327, repeated AiG II.2.924), is that it is derived from the univerbation of a syntactic sequence *kuvít sá* (roughly "is it indeed this one?"), which is then secondarily inflected. This seems the more likely explanation, and in fact there is such a sequence attested in IV.51.4 *kuvít sá*. This passage contains a deliberative either/or question "should it be the old course or a new one …?" *kuvít sá … sanáyo návo vā yā́maḥ*, a context that favors development into an indefinite of

the type "someone or other." In fact, our passage might be more clearly rendered as "to the cattle enclosure of someone or other."

VI.45.25–27: There is no obvious unifying feature in this tṛca, though Indra is compared to a cow in the first two vss.

VI.45.25: On the intensive pf. *nonuvuḥ* see Schaeffer (45) and Kü (283).

VI.45.27: This vs. is identical to III.41.6, q.v. The lack of accent on *mandasvā* despite the following *hí* is puzzling.

VI.45.28–30: Again no unity in the tṛca.

VI.45.28: Although, as just noted, there's no unity in the tṛca, there is some continuity between tṛcas. Like the first vs. of the previous tṛca (25), this one has polarized nom. #*imā́ḥ* … *gíraḥ*# "these songs" framing the first hemistich, which responds to the acc. *gíraḥ* in the middle of the tṛca before that (23c). Moreover, the simile "like cows their calf" (28c) reprises "like mothers their calf" in 25c.

VI.45.29: This vs. is syntactically dependent on 28, with the acc. *purūtámam* picking up *tvā* in 28a.
        The cognate expression *vā́jebhir vājayatā́m* "competing for the prize with their prizes" is a bit puzzling. I interpr. it as being a slight play on words, with the instr. *vā́jebhiḥ* referring to the singers' songs, expressing the means by which they compete, while the prizes they compete for are material goods and fame. This interpr. is somewhat supported by the next vs., where we hope that our praise-song is the most successful one.

VI.45.30: Notice the very un-Ārya phonology of the name of the patron, Bṛbu with two plain *b*'s. (On Bṛbu as patron see Kuiper, *Aryans*, p. 6.) It is probably not an accident that this vs. contains only one of two reff. to the Gaṅgā in the RV (the other a voc. *gaṅge* in X.75.5), since the Gaṅgā is at the limits of the RVic geographical horizon.
        The simile is more lit. "(he is) broad like the Gangetic girth."

VI.45.31: Pādas ab are identical to VIII.94.3. For my interpr. of the hemistich and esp. of the phrase *aryá ā́* see comm. there. Given the un-Ārya phonology of Bṛbu's name, there may be a particular pleasure in hymning the un-Ārya patron Bṛbu *away from* the *arí-*

VI.46 Indra
        This hymn nicely demonstrates the distribution of impv. forms to √*bhū* that I discussed in my 1997 "Syntactic constraints on morphological change: The Vedic imperatives bodhi, dehi, and dhehi": *bháva/bhava* is found initial (3d) or final (10d, 11a) in its pāda or clause, while *bodhi* is internal (4c).

VI.46.1–2: Although the presence of *hí*, with its generally causal value, is often a puzzle when it appears in the first pāda of a hymn, this one helps signal the conceptual unity of this opening tṛca, with vs. 1 providing the various circumstances under which we call upon Indra and vs. 2 containing the contents of our latest address to the god -- a call for additional generosity from him.

The poet plays with the 2nd sg. pronoun. Historically -- and usually synchronically in the RV -- the nom. sg. *tvám* is disyllabic (*t^{u}vám*) and the acc. sg. *tvắm* is monosyllabic, with occasional distraction to two syllables in analogy to the nom. But here the 1st vs. has three distracted acc. sg. *t^{u}vắm*, prominently pāda-initial (a, c, d), while the nom. sg. at the beginning of the 2nd vs. is monosyllabic. To match disyllabic *t^{u}vắm*, in 2a the two syllables are filled out by the addition of the pleonastic *sá* (#*sá tvám*), which is syntactically at home as subject marker of the 2nd sg. impv. *kira* (see my 1992 "Vedic 'sá figé': An inherited sentence connective?"). Since *sá* in such contexts is unnecessary, its presence draws attention to the metrical interchange between the nom. and acc. of the pronoun here.

VI.46.2: Ge takes *rathyàm* as an adj. modifying *áśvam* (Wagenross); Gr does as well, assigning the form to the *vṛkī*-inflected stem *rathī-* (so also Lub). Neither of these interpr. is impossible; however, I prefer to take *rathyàm* as belonging to the marginal them. stem *rathyà-* (beside better attested *ráthya-*) and also to take it as a third term in the gifts we want from Indra. There is nothing riding on the choice of interpr., however.

VI.46.3: This vs. shows some continuities with the previous pragātha: the root noun cmpd *satrāhā* (3a) echoes *satrā* in 2d, as *satpate* (3c) does *sátpatim* in 1c. There is also the variant 1st pl. mid. root form to √*hū/hvā*, *hūmahe* (3b), which contrasts with *hávāmahe* in 1a. I can see no difference in sense here, and I think there are several other factors at work. On the one hand, extremely common *hávāmahe* (+/- accent) is almost never pāda-internal, whereas the rare-ish *hūmáhe* (+/- accent) appears about half the time in that position (but see pāda-final *hūmahe* in 6b) -- so it partly replicates the *bháva/bodhi* distribution discussed above. But perhaps more important is that the poet seems to be playing with metrical variants in a way similar to *sá tvám* discussed above. Pāda b reads *índraṃ tám hūmahe vayám*. There is no good reason for *tám* because *índram* more than sufficiently provides the acc. obj.; moreover, all things being equal, *tám* (and its paradigmatic fellows) generally opens its pāda/clause and in particular does not follow a coreferential noun. The common 1st pl. *havāmahe*, already found in 1a, would easily fit in a version of this pāda that lacked the *tám*: **índraṃ havāmahe vayám*. I suggest that the poet called attention to his manipulation of the variant verb forms by inserting a pleonastic *tám*, like the pleonastic *sá* in 2a, and inserting it in the "wrong" place, which would draw the attention of his audience even more.

VI.46.4: *vṛṣabhéva* is somewhat problematic: the Pp. analyzes it as *vṛṣabhắ iva*, which is phonologically impeccable, but what form would *vṛṣabhắ* represent? Old's solution (flg. Lanman, Noun Inflection 329) that it is an underlying nom. sg. is surely the most likely, whether we subscribe to Lanman's "crasis after elision [of the *s*]," i.e., *vṛṣabhás iva* → *vṛṣabha iva* → *-e-*. The publ. tr., as well as Ge., implicitly follows this route. A long-shot possibility is that the Pp. *vṛṣabhắ* is the underlying form, and it's an old instr. sg. modifying

or doubling *manyúnā*: "with bullish battle-fury" or "with battle-fury as a bull." But *vŕṣan-* is the 'bull' stem generally used (quasi-)adjectivally, not *vṛṣabhá-*. It might also be possible to see it as a voc. *vṛṣabha*: this would easily account for the sandhi, but we would have to assume it got secondarily accented after it was no longer understood as a voc., and this would also introduce the interpretational problem of a voc. in a simile (though unfortunately there are a few such).

On the problematic *ṛcīṣama* see the despairing comm. ad I.61.1.

The three loc. in d specify the 'stakes' (*dhaná-*) referred to by *mahādhané*.

VI.46.5: The voc. phrase in c, *citra vajrahasta*, is repeated from 2a.

The verb *prāḥ* must be read disyllabically. It could therefore technically be a subjunctive (so apparently Gr), and in fact the light first syllable required could reflect the loss of root-final laryngeal before the subjunctive suffixal vowel. Hoffmann insistently calls it an injunc. (215 n. 201, 221), fld. by Lub, and the publ. tr. ("you … fill") reflects an injunctive interpr. But since this is not a cosmogonic act -- Indra is filling the world halves with "fame" -- a subjunctive interpr. is possible, esp. following the impv.: "bring us fame with which you *will fill* both these world-halves." I consider this a possible, perhaps even desirable alternative.

VI.46.6: The distracted acc. *tʰvám* from 1a, c, d returns here, again as object of "we call," but with *hūmahe* rather than the *hávāmahe* of vs. 1.

VI.46.7–8: This pragātha is stitched together by the *yád (vā)* construction (7a, c, 8a, b).

VI.46.7: The main cl. begins in the middle (or rather towards the end) of pāda c, with *ā́ bhara*. Since this phrase is only 3 syllables, the audience would not mistake the syntactic break for a pāda break despite the extra length of the c-pāda in Bṛhatī.

satrā́ reappears once again (cf. 2d, 3a).

VI.46.8: On the verbal rection of *turváṇe* see Keydana (Inf., 245–47). Note also that the circumstantial loc. *nṛṣāhye* "at the conquering of men" and the purpose infinitival phrase *amitrā̃n … turváṇe* "to vanquish our foes" have the same semantic structure, though different syntax.

VI.46.9–10: The unity of this pragātha is required by the fact that the rel. cl. of 10ab must depend on the imperatival cl. of 9d, with initial *yé* (10a) picking up the last word of 9, *ebhyaḥ* 'from those'.

VI.46.10: *dhṛṣṇuyā́* reprises 2a.

VI.46.11–12: This pragātha shows both internal and external connections. As in the previous pragātha the 2nd vs. is syntactically dependent on the first, with the *yátra* clause of 12ab parallel to the *yád* clause of 11cd and both subordinate to the imperatival clause of

11b. In addition the first and last hemistichs (11ab, 12cd) open identically, with *ádha smā*, which echoes *ádha smā* of the last hemistich of the previous pragātha (10cd).

On the particular connection of vs. 12 with vs. 9 see immed. below.

VI.46.11: The first pāda is a bare variant of 3d: both contain the complex verbal construction *vrdhé √bhū* 'be for strengthening / be there to strengthen', each with the complement enclitic *nah*. The only difference is the placement of the impv.: initial *bhávā* in 3d, final *bhava* in 11a, differing only in accent and, possibly, in the length of the final vowel: the Pp. resolves the cross-pāda sandhi *bhavéndra* with short *bhava*, like 10d, but a long vowel would be equally possible.

VI.46.12: The publ. tr. contains a grammatical error. It takes *priyā̆* as modifying fem. pl. *tanvàh*, but the sandhi context of *priyā̆* makes this impossible: it would have to be **priyāh*. It must modify *śárma* (as Ge takes it, also Gr), which must then be a neut. *plural* to the -*an*-stem. This tr. should be corrected to "… stretch wide their own bodies as dear shelters …"

Ge takes *tanvàh* and *śárma* as implicitly conjoined ("Wo die Tapferen ihre Leiber breit machen (and) die lieben Schilde des Vaters"), but I think it more likely that the champions are stretching their bodes to *serve as* shelters/shields. Under this interpr. the plural of *śárma* makes sense: multiple bodies multiple shields.

Pādas abc strongly echo 9abc, with the c pādas esp. close, both containing the VP *chardír yacha* (in opposite order and non-contiguous in 12c) + conjoined DAT. beneficiary (9c *maghávadbhyaś ca máhyaṃ ca*; 12c *tanvè táne ca*). However, the first hemistich of 12 varies tellingly from 9ab: in 9 it is Indra who holds out the shelter (*śaraṇám*), which is equated with the *chardíh* of c, but in 12 it is the mortal champions (*śūrāsah*) who offer their own bodies as shelter (*śárma*). (Although the two words for 'shelter' are different, they are transparently related and share the same descriptors elsewhere.) The bodies of the mortal warriors are theirs to deploy, but also under the protection of Indra, as shown not only by *tanvè* in the next pāda as recipient of Indra's protection, but also by *tanūpắh* 'protector of bodies' in 10d, applied to Indra.

The last pādas of vss. 9 and 12 provide the final thread of connection between the two vss., since both contain the impv. *yāváyǎ* 'keep away'. In 12d the accent on the verb is anomalous, but I have no trouble assuming that it was adapted from 9d, where the initial position of the verb requires it.

VI.46.13–14: As was noted in the publ. intro., this last pragātha stands somewhat apart from the rest of the hymn, though it does show connections with the beginning of the hymn. The near repetition found between the last two pragāthas (9–10 / 11–12; see disc. above) gave the sense that the hymn was coming to an end. As often, RVic poets seem to enjoy shaking up our structural expectations. The lack of a main clause in the whole of this two-vs. complex is especially striking and ends the hymn on an unsettled and somewhat frenzied note.

VI.46.13: The form *árvatah* ends the first pāda of this vs. and the last of vs. 1, but with different grammatical identities: gen. sg. in 1d, acc. pl. here. This difference may be one

indication that this pragātha both responds to the rest of the hymn and distances itself from it.

mahādhané is repeated from 4c.

VI.46.14: While vs. 13 has a relatively perspicuous structure -- a single transitive yád clause whose final pāda is a simile matching the acc. direct object -- vs. 14 is a structural mess. Its first pāda is another simile in the acc. matching the direct object of vs. 13; it is followed by a yádi (or *yád ī; see below) clause (b), which may or may not contain a verb, followed by a rel. cl. (cd) introduced by yé, containing another simile referring to the same direct object but now in the nom. By now the original referent is quite distant, and it is not entirely clear which parts belong to the simile, which to the frame.

Pāda b is esp. problematic, mostly because of the ambiguity of the phrase ánu ṣváṇi, in which sváni has been identified variously as a noun or as a verb. The preponderance of opinion favors the former: Whitney (§390b, though see Roots, where he lists it, with ?, as an aor.), Gr (though he allows for the other poss.), Ge, Lub. On the other hand, Old, flg. BR, considers it a verb form, a passive aorist. Wackernagel (AiG III.23) is uncertain. The noun-faction is further divided by what stem they assign it to: neut. -i-stem (Gr, Lub), root noun in -an- (Wh, and presumably Ge, since he tr. it as a loc. "im Getöse"). If it is a noun ('sound', vel sim.), a verb needs to be supplied with ánu, but this of course would pose no problem. I am always reluctant to oppose Old, and in this particular case there is strong objective evidence that he is correct, namely the close sandhi effect that retroflexes ṣ after ánu. A collection of all s-forms after ánu produces remarkably clear-cut results: ánu only retroflexes following verb forms, never nominal forms. Although it may seem overkill to list all the examples, the collection may be useful for other purposes:

ánu + VERB: I.167.10 [=182.8, III.39.8] ánu ṣyāt, I.185.4 ánu ṣyāma, V.73.4 ánu ṣṭáve, VIII.3.8 ánu ṣṭuvanti. There is only one verbal form without retroflexion: IV.4.2 ánu spṛśa.

ánu + NOMINAL (etc.): I.33.11 [=I.88.6, 176.2, III.51.11, IV.33.6, 52.6, VII.56.13, VIII.88.5] ánu svadhā́m, I.80.1 (etc.) ánu svarā́jyam, I.121.3 ánu svajā́m, I.134.1 ánu sūnṛ́tā, I.191.15 ánu saṃvátaḥ, III.7.6 [=V.59.1, IX.63.6] ánu svám, III.33.3 ánu saṃcárantī, III.35.8 ánu svā́ḥ, IV.40.4 ánu saṃtávītvat, IV.45.6 ánu svadháyā, V.32.10 ánu svadhā́vne, V.34.1 ánu svadhā́mitā, VI.25.8 ánu sáho, VII.7.2 [X.14.2] ánu svā́ḥ, VII.31.7 ánu svadhā́varī, VIII.4.8 ánu spighyàm, VIII.6.38 ánu suvā́nāsa, IX.103.5 ánu svadhā́ḥ, X.17.11 ánu saṃcárantam, X.17.11 ánu saptá, X.56.3 ánu satyā́, X.103.6 ánu sám.

Among the nominals it is striking how many begin with sv- as in our case.

I can see only one possible conclusion, that Old must be right, this is a 3rd sg. passive (or rather, intransitive) aor., and we need to supply a subject. Old suggests chariot, which seems reasonable. As he points out, the RV has a bahuvrīhi svanád-ratha- lit. 'having a sounding chariot' (though prob. used as a PN), and a chariot sounding "following the roar (of the horses)" makes sense. II.4.6 vā́r ṇá pathā́ rā́thyeva svānī́t "like water along a path, like chariot (wheels) he has sounded" provides a parallel not only for the sounding chariot, but also for the rushing, sounding rivers in the simile of pāda a.

A few other loose ends in pāda b: I interpr. *yádi* as *yád ī "when it," with shortening of *ī* before the cluster *kl*. A condition 'if' doesn't make sense. As for that cluster, *klóśa-* is the only *-l-*form to √*kruś* 'cry out'. Is this racetrack slang?

Pāda c compares the steeds circling the race course to birds (of prey) circling over the raw flesh of a dead animal (a striking image). Ge considers the loc. *gávi* to be the correspondent of *ā́miṣi* in the simile: the cow is the prize over which the horses circle ("die wie die Vögel um das Aas, so um die Kuh(herde) kreisen"). The publ. tr. by contrast takes *gávi* as a piece of horse tack, the reins or something else made of leather, and construes it with *gṛbhītā́ḥ*. I now favor Ge's interpr., which is more striking and which also conforms to the loc. of the stake found several times in this hymn. I would amend the tr. to "who, like birds over raw flesh, keep circling (the race course) over the bovine (prize), being held firm in your two arms …"

VI.47 Indra

VI.47.1–5: As indicated in the publ. intro., the first 5 vss. of the hymn constitute a praise of soma, shading, towards the end, into simultaneous praise of Indra. It is formally unified: beginning with vs. 2, all but one (2cd) of the hemistichs begins with *ayám*, and vs. 1 contains four exx. of *ayám* as well (2 each in the 1st 2 pādas), though oddly positioned.

VI.47.1: Although this vs. is quite straightforward in general, it has some peculiarities. To begin with, the four nominal clauses with *ayám* in the first hemistich are all in the unusual order X *ayám*, which is reversed (/repaired) in the four subsequent vss. See esp. the opening of 1a *svādúṣ kílāyám* corrected to the more standard 2a *ayáṃ svādúḥ*. I have no idea what motivated the X *ayám* order.

It is not clear to me whether the four clauses name four different types/preparations of soma or all four refer to a single soma (or, in some way, both: all soma drinks, no matter how prepared, are in essence one).

Note also the particle *kíla*, which is rare in the RV, esp. outside of X: only 5 of the 12 occurrences are not in X, and 2 of them are in this vs.

I am also puzzled by the accent on *asyá* in c. Since the soma is amply referred to earlier in the vs., we would expect unaccented *asya* (cf., e.g., *papivā́n̐ índro asya* V.29.3, 30.11). I have no explanation, and it seems not to have bothered any other commentator.

VI.47.2: This vs. chains rel. clauses, with the gen. rel. *yásya* in b referring to the soma in a, while nom. *yáḥ* in cd refers to Indra, who first appears in the rel. cl. of b.

It is difficult (though perhaps not impossible) to construe *ví … hán* 'smash apart' with the acc. *cyautnā́* 'exploits' in c as well as the more likely object *dehyàḥ* 'walls' in d. It is therefore best to follow Ge (also Hoffmann, Injunk. 168) and supply a form of √*kṛ* or the like in c.

VI.47.3–5: As noted in the publ. intro. as well as above, the praise of soma modulates towards praise of Indra in this sequence, starting in the 2nd half of vs. 3. The first half of 3 clearly identifies soma as referent with the ppl. *pītáḥ* 'when drunk', but the cosmogonic

deeds of 3d and of at least the first half of 4 begin to sound Indraic. We are brought abruptly back to soma in 4d (*sómo dādhāra*), but this almost seems like a trick or a feint to keep us from drifting further. And vs. 5 again sounds Indraic, esp. the final *vṛṣabhó marútvān* "the bull accompanied by the Maruts": *marútvant-* is overwhelmingly an epithet of Indra. For a similar nearby sequence of vss. that oscillates between soma and Indra (and also uses *ayám* as an organizing word) see VI.44.22–24 and comm. ad loc.

VI.47.3: It is not clear what noun to supply with fem. pl. *urvī́ḥ*, though something like 'worlds (so Ge), realms' makes sense. The same *ṣáḍ urvī́ḥ* is found in X.14.16 in unclear context, and as a voc. in X.128.5 *dévīḥ ṣaḍ urvī́ḥ* 'you six broad goddesses', again with uncertain referent. Elsewhere *urvī́ḥ* applies to waters or rivers, but liquid doesn't seem appropriate here. Perhaps in our vs. it's evoking a pl. of *pṛthivī́* 'earth', with a pun on a different word for 'broad', *urú-*, *urvī́-*. Note that *pṛthivī́-* occurs in the next vs., dependent on *varimán-* 'expanse', which is derivationally related to *urú-*.

VI.47.4: The first hemistich has a repetitive structure inside a chiastic frame. The opening *ayáṃ sá yáḥ* is balanced by *ayáṃ sáḥ* at the end of b; we might perhaps expect **yó ayáṃ sáḥ* in fact. The single verb *ákṛṇot*, inside this frame, does for both objects, which are responsive: morphologically identical and near-rhyming acc. *varimā́ṇam … varṣmā́ṇam*, each with a dependent gen. belonging to a matched semantic pair, *pṛthivyā́ḥ … diváḥ*.

      Pāda c is problematic. It lacks a verb, so it is impossible to know for sure what relations are envisioned among the ill-assorted lexical items; the real-world referents of *pīyū́ṣam* 'beestings' and *tisṛ́ṣu pravátsu* "on/in the three slopes" are uncertain; it is not even clear whether it should be grouped with ab or with d. Ge groups it loosely with d, renders *pīyū́ṣam* as "Seim" and *tisṛ́ṣu pravátsu* as "in die drei Strömen," and supplies "hat … geschaffen" as the verb. I am not sure what he's trying to convey, and *pravát-* does not straightforwardly mean 'stream', but 'slope' or 'plunge'. The publ. tr. takes c with ab, supplying *ákṛṇot* from there, but I am now doubtful about this, in part on the basis of IX.109.6 *divó dhartā́si śukráḥ pīyū́ṣaḥ* "You, the gleaming beestings, are the supporter of heaven," where soma is identified as *pīyū́ṣa-* and identified as an upholder (*dhartár-*), reminiscent of our d *sómo dādhāra*. As for *tisṛ́ṣu pravátsu*, I wonder if this is shorthand for "*pravát-* plus two" as expressed in VII.50.4 *praváto nívata udvátaḥ* "(from) the slope, the depth, and the height"—possibly referring to the three worlds, which all appear in this verse: heaven and earth in ab, the midspace in d. Perhaps the idea is that Soma placed or supports the distillation of himself, his liquid essence, in all three worlds. If this is so, a form of √*dhṛ* borrowed from d would work better than √*kṛ* from ab.

      I also now realize that the preterital tr. of *dādhāra* in d, matching that of Ge ("hat … befestigt"), is wrong, since, as Kü points out, the pf. of √*dhṛ* is always presential.

      Putting this all together, I would alter the tr. of cd to "this one (upholds) his 'beestings' in the three "slopes" (=worlds); Soma upholds the broad midspace," with absolutely no certainty about the rendering of c.

VI.47.5: HvN divide the 2nd hemistich as … *skámbhanenód # dᶦyā́m*, with *úd* the final of pāda a and *dᶦyā́m* distracted and pāda-initial. But this is clearly wrong: *úd* is a preverb in

tmesis with *astabhnāt* and should open the pāda, and *dyā́m* is rarely if ever distracted. Lub's division is correct.

As noted above, the 2ⁿᵈ hemistich of this vs. sounds esp. Indraic.

VI.47.6: *rayi-sthā́na-* is a bahuvrīhi, lit. 'having your place/standing in wealth' vel sim., though the publ. tr. is less awk.

VI.47.7: The vs. is built on variant repetition: ab *prá ṇah …, prá naḥ … prataram* / c *su-pāró ati-pārayó* / d *sú-nītiḥ … vāmá-nītiḥ*.

I have no idea why in the identical sequence *prá + naḥ*, the first has retroflexed *ṇ* and the latter does not. Both *prá*-s are preverbs in tmesis with 2ⁿᵈ sg. impvs. (*paśya* and *naya*). The only differences are 1) the first *prá* sequence is not initial (being preceded by voc. *índra*), 2) in the second sequence the impv. immediately follows *naḥ*, while in the first some verbal material intervenes, and 3) in the first *naḥ* functions as a dat. but in the second as an acc. None of these differences should (as far as I can see) trigger different sandhi effects.

VI.47.9: The vs. contains three phonologically similar splvs., stationed at pāda edge: #*váriṣṭhe* ... #*váhiṣṭhayoḥ* ... / ... *várṣiṣṭhām*#. This is somewhat reminiscent of the phonological/morphological figure in 4ab *varimā́ṇam … varṣmā́ṇam*, esp. since *váriṣṭhe* and *várṣiṣṭhām* belong to the same roots as the two forms in 4.

In b the HvN text should read *śatā́vann*. This voc. is variously interpr. (see Old for some reff.), but I follow Ge, and implicitly the Pp., in taking it as (metrically) lengthened **śata-van*, to a *-van*-stem, contra Gr's *śata-ava(n)t-*, with the pres. part. of √*av* 'help'. This *śatā-van-* would be a byform of better attested *śatá-vant-*. It needs to belong to a *-van*-rather than a *-vant-* stem because otherwise the expected voc. would be *-vas*. But we find *-vant-* and *-van-* stems side-by-side, notably in *maghávan(t)-*. Debrunner (AiG II.2, most clearly p. 904, citing this passage) argues that *-vant*-stems are "sachlich" while *-van*-stems are "persönlich," which would work for *śatávant-* versus our *śatā́van-*, but not, obviously, for *maghávan(t)-*.

The tr. of d is disputed. Ge takes *rā́yaḥ* as nom. pl. (as it generally is) and the subj. of the sg. verb *tārīt*: "nicht sollen die Reichtümer eines hohen Herren die unseren überbieten." This requires that the sg. verb take a *masc.* pl. subj. While the neut. pl. + sg. verb construction is fairly rare, but attested and inherited, I do not know of masculine pl. equivalents. Old (ZDMG 54: 170) thinks the incongruity of number is the result of the adjustment to the formulaic nature of *rā́yo aryáḥ*, tr. "mögen uns nicht die Kargen den Reichtum überwinden," with *aryáḥ* nom. pl. of *arí-* -- in other words a *different* masc. pl. subj. with sg. verb. Thieme (Fremdling, 56–57) makes appropriately short work of both of these proposals, but I find his own solution puzzling: "Möge nicht überholen unsere Reichtümer [der] des Fremdlings." Since he adamantly rejects the masc. pl. + sg. verb interpr., all I can figure is that he's generating a *singular *rayíḥ* to serve as subject (represented by his bracketed [der]), but there is no support for this and it seems an artifice of convenience. No doubt mine does, too: like Thieme I take *rā́yaḥ* as acc. pl., as it sometimes is (though *rāyáḥ* would be expected), and for sg. subj. I supply *íṣ-* 'refreshment' from the previous pāda. I also interpr. the verb *tārīt* not as hostile 'overcome' but as a plain

verb of motion 'cross over to'; cf. usages like *átāriṣma támasaḥ pā́ram asyá* "we have crossed over to the far shore of this darkness" (I.92.6 = I.183-84.6, VII.73.1). The point is that the refreshment we've begged Indra for should not fall into enemy hands.

As discussed esp. ad IV.48.1 and VI.14.3, 20.1, I take the phrase *rā́yo aryáḥ* "riches of the stranger" as referring to manpower.

VI.47.10: For the simile in b, see VI.3.5.

VI.47.11: √*hvā* is the signature word here.

VI.47.11–13: The first pāda of 12 recasts that of 11: with *sutrā́mā* matching *trātāram* and *sᵘvā́vāṁ ávobhiḥ* matching *avitā́ram*; 13a then repeats *sutrā́mā sᵘvā́vān*. The connections between 12–13 and neighboring vss. in this hymn make it less likely (at least to me) that they are direct evidence of the Sautrāmaṇī ritual here, instead of being pressed into service of that ritual later. See publ. intro.

VI.47.12: In addition to the repetition just described, 12b *sumṛḷīkó bhavatu* is a variant of 10a *mṛḷá*, and *ábhayaṃ kṛṇotu* reminds us of 8ab *ánu neṣi … ábhayam*.

VI.47.14: The long vowel of *urū́* is puzzling. Since it appears in the simile *urū́ ná rā́dhaḥ*, it should be neut. sg. *urú*, and acdg. to Gr and AiG III.145 (with reff.) it is, with metrical lengthening. By contrast, Lub identifies it as a nom. pl. Since the frame corresponding to this simile is neut. pl. *sávanāni purū́ni*, I also prefer neut. pl.; it may show attraction to the number of the frame: "the many pressings are broad like your bounty."

As Ge (n. 14d) cleverly points out, the waters, cows, and drops are the three ingredients of soma.

VI.47.15–18: As noted in the publ. intro., this section, which concerns Indra's fickle attentions to various clients in turn, is marked grammatically by āmreḍitas and intensives (i.e., iterative/frequentatives), expressing the constantly shifting nature of the actions and their objects. See the publ. intro. for the continuity of content I see in this section.

VI.47.15: Ge renders d exactly opposite to the publ. tr.: "so macht er den Vorderen zum Hintermann" (fld. by Klein, "āmreḍitas": "he makes the one at the fore into one who lags behind"). But the simile in c is about walking one step at a time ("putting his two feet down one after the other"), and unless Indra is walking backwards my interpr. must be correct. It's true that *pū́rvam* 'in front' precedes *áparam* 'behind' in the text, but word order is scarcely a reliable guide in the RV, esp. since in nominal sentences we often get PREDICATE SUBJECT order. (Furthermore, there's a sort of iconic ordering of the two adjectives, with *pū́rva-* first, which can be independent of the larger sense.)

VI.47.16: In d *víśaḥ … manuṣyā̀n* do not match in gender. Old suggests that the latter might be gen. pl., and Ge's tr. as such: "die Stämme der Menschen." I see no reason not to take it as the acc. pl. it appears to be, as a parallel obj. to *víśaḥ*, not a modifier.

VI.47.17: The *pū́rva-/ápara-* binary returns from 15, but here I think it not only refers to those ahead and behind positionally (as there), but also has a temporal sense (not represented in the publ. tr.): his previous allies in pāda a he dumps in favor of newer ones in b.

The hapax *ánānubhūtī́ḥ* is not entirely clear, but two things must be kept in mind: 1) it's a fem. pl., presumably acc.; 2) its sense must be derived from *ánu √bhū*, which generally means 'come close to, give way to'. Because of 1), it should modify *śarádaḥ* 'autumns', a fem. cons. stem (so Ge). But Ge's rendering "dass sie an ihm nicht wahrgenommen werden" seems distant in sense from the verbal lexeme; Old's "(alles) Sichnichtanschliessen …" seems closer. I take the cmpd as a bahuvrīhi meaning 'having no intimacy' and interpr. it as proleptic in an expression of purpose: Indra shakes off the years *so that* they do not come close/attach themselves to him. (Ge's "dass sie … nicht …" has the same proleptic purpose interpr.) The point is that one can't get old if one keeps the years at a distance; my "close in" is meant to capture the slangy tone of the passage (see also "double-cross" in b).

VI.47.18: This vs. concerns Indra's shape-shifting propensity, enabled by his *māyā́-*. It is a slightly more complex formulation of III.53.8 *rūpám-rūpam maghávā bobhavīti, māyā́ḥ kṛṇvānás tanvàm pári svā́m* "Form after form the bounteous one assumes, wrapping his own body in tricks." Although *prátirūpo babhūva* should lit. mean "he has become one having a form corresponding …," this seemed awkward.

Ge thinks the form in b is Indra's *true* form, to be recognized behind the various disguises in pāda a; by contrast, I think each form Indra assumes is meant for display and none of them is the "real" one. *práti √cakṣ* is the lexeme used for the display of the girl at the svayaṃvara; see its use with Dawn in I.113.11 and 124.8. Each constituency is shown a different form—hence the āmreḍita *rūpám-rūpam* in a and the thousand horses in d, which presumably take each different form of Indra in a different direction.

VI.47.19: This vs. makes a small ring with vs. 15, both containing *káḥ* + SUBJUNCTIVE. The fact that this vs. is in a different meter (Br̥hatī, not Triṣṭubh) from the whole hymn that precedes it may also signal the end of a section. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this vs. is meant as reassurance: in contrast to the endlessly multiplying Indra of vs. 18 (and the fickle Indra of the previous vss.), Tvaṣṭar has now taken control, yoking only a single team (for Indra's journey, in my opinion) and exerting his dominion over forms, thus reining in Indra's excess shape-shifting. Although the word *rūpá-* does not appear in the vs., it can be easily supplied with *bhū́ri* on the basis of Tvaṣṭar's well-known role as shaper of forms (cf. Macd., Ved. Myth. 116, and passages like I.188.9, VIII.10.28, X.100.9, 184.1).

The 2nd hemistich poses a rhetorical question about Indra (unnamed): why would Indra stick by the enemy when our sacrifice is so appealing? We are essentially urging him to switch sides again, and since he does so frequently, we have hope of succeeding.

Assuming that *pákṣa* in sandhi represents *pákṣaḥ* (so Pp), it belongs to a neut. *s*-stem found only here in the RV, but attested in AV and elsewhere. This requires us to allow an

acc. with √*ās* 'sit', rather than the usual loc. There is no warrant to emend the accent to *pakṣá* and take it as a loc. to the -*á*-stem.

Pāda d constitutes a loc. abs., with the part. *ā́sīna*- used pregnantly for 'sitting (a sattra)'. The introductory *utá* is curious, since there is nothing it can conventionally conjoin. Klein (DGRV 45–56) classifies it with the unclassifiable residue of *utá* forms, tr. it 'especially'. The publ. tr. follows this tack. However, I think we can derive it from the standard uses of *utá* 'and'. English has an idiom in which 'and' is used to add as an afterthought what the speaker considers the clinching, but somewhat off-topic, circumstantial argument -- as in a sequence like "why would he break up with her now-- and with her just graduated?"

VI.47.20: The pres. part. *satī́* in b is concessive, while *saté* in the same position in d is not.

VI.47.21: My tr. differs conceptually and syntactically from Ge's, also, to a lesser degree, from Schmidt's (B+I 83). Ge thinks the obj. *sadṛ́śīḥ … kṛṣṇā́ḥ … jā́ḥ* refers to the nights ("die … gleichen (Nächte), die schwarzen Kinder") and that *anyám árdham* "the other side" is the goal to which Indra drove the nights. Acdg. to him, this is a different image of the singer's Not -- the first narrowness, the second unbroken night. I find the supposed change of topic, from the tight place in which we found ourselves in vs. 20, unlikely; instead I consider this vs. a continuation of vs. 20, in which Indra drives away the enemy, as often described as black or dark, that implicitly hemmed us in, a view shared by Schmidt. However, the latter agrees with Ge in taking *anyám árdham* as a goal, "Täglich vertrieb er die gleichen schwarzen Kinder von ihrem Sitz an die andere (Welt-)Hälfte," whereas I consider it a characterization of the enemy and so in apposition to *sadṛ́śīḥ … kṛṣṇā́ḥ … jā́ḥ*, the phrase into which it's interleaved. The "other half" would be the alternately favored and disfavored sides in vss. 15–18, as well as the "side of the hostile" (*dviṣatáḥ pákṣaḥ*) of 19c.

HvN disassemble the sandhi across cd as *vasnayánta*, but this dual must have a long final; so Pp.

The part. *vasna-yántā* is a hapax, but related to *vasná*- 'price', *ványa*- 'to be sold, up for sale'. It modifies the two enemies of Indra, Varcin and Śambara, of whom we know little beyond Indra's enmity towards them. The denom. *vasna-yá*- is therefore interpretable in a number of ways. Gr takes it as 'feilschen' (haggle), while Ge tr. 'Lösegeld fordern' (demand ransom), calling the two enemies Raubritter (robber barons) in his intro. (p. 144). EWA posts both tr., though they do not seem at all equivalent to me. Schmidt returns to Gr's feilschen. I add yet another possibility -- 'mercenaries' -- on the basis of a literal rendering of normal denom. semantics 'seek X', hence 'seek a price'. But given the state of our ignorance about these two foes, no interpr. is secure (though I very much doubt that the two were 'haggling' with Indra when he picked up his vajra). We should note that in the next vs. (22c), we accept "the goods belonging to Śambara" (*śā́mbarám vásu*), which may refer to Śambara's *vasná*- in 21, though not in a way that disambiguates it.

Gr takes *udávraje* as a PN, Ge as a place name. My tr. follows Schmidt's interpr. (83–84) as a bahuvrīhi 'dessen Hürde das Wasser ist', as a description of a mountain surrounded (or semi-surrounded) by a body of water.

VI.47.22: *kóśayī-* is a hapax; its difference, if any, from well-attested *kóśa-*, which also appears in the following vs., in the same number of 'ten', can't be determined.

VI.47.25: The verb *abhy àyaṣṭa* is problematic, at least in my view. It is supposed to be the 3rd sg. mid. root aor. to √*yaj* 'sacrifice'. The form is morphologically impeccable, but 1) *abhí* is not found with √*yaj* anywhere else in the RV, or indeed in Vedic; 2) for √*yaj* 'sacrifice to' to take an acc. of humans, rather than the standard gods, is skirting blasphemy. In this passage it is said to mean 'honor', but it is hard to see how the ubiquitous root √*yaj* could be so bleached, nor why the addition of the preverb *abhí* would effect this change. The publ. tr. "has reached towards" reflects a different analysis. I suggest that it actually belongs to the root aor. of √*(n)aś* 'reach, attain', which does appear fairly regularly with *abhí*. A putative injunc. in this lexeme, **abh(í)y aṣṭa*, could have produced a segmentation **abhí-yaṣṭa*, and in turn an augmented form *abhí ayaṣṭa* could have been generated to it. The sense of the passage might be similar to the current (annoying) English idiom "reach out to," meaning "proactively contact in a positive way," and refer to the Sārñjaya's transfer of goods to the Bharadvāja poets. However, I recognize that it is generally preferable not to posit such a morphological misunderstanding and reformation, and also that my semantic substitution isn't altogether compelling.

VI.47.26–31: These vss. are repeated in the Aśvamedha section of several early Vedic ritual texts, directly after the 1st 14 vss. of the weapon hymn VI.75 (e.g., VS XXIX.52-57, TS IV.6.6.

VI.47.26: Because of the *hí*, I have made ab the causal foundation for the beginning of c. If we are willing to allow *hí* to be some kind of unspecified emphatic, the clauses can be disjoined, with the first hemistich simply "you should become …"

    As in the matching sequence … *pratáraṇaḥ suvîraḥ* in I.91.19, 'lifetime' could be supplied as the implicit obj. of *pratáraṇaḥ*.

VI.47.27: The awkward 'strongness' in English tr. is meant to represent the difference between *ójas-* 'strength' in pāda a, the standard nominal abstract to this root, and *ojmán-*, found only here in the RV, though attested in subsequent Vedic texts.

    Although the ref. to the chariot in vs. 26 is hardly transparent, in *this* vs. it has become a barely solvable riddle. In particular, "the strongness of the waters enclosed by cows" (*apām ojmānam pári góbhir āvṛtam*) could not be interpr. without 26a, c: the "strongness of the waters" is presumably the tree (*vánas-páti-* in 26a, 27b), or rather the wood of the tree -- so called because plants grow only when watered. "Enclosed by cows" recalls 26c "knotted together with cows' (hide)" (*góbhiḥ sáṃnaddhaḥ*), referring to the leather that binds the wooden parts.

VI.47.28: Why the chariot is all the things it's implicitly identified with in ab is not entirely clear: it is the mace of Indra presumably because it performs similar assaults, and the face of the Maruts presumably because its front is as glittery and fast-moving as they are. But the Mitra and Varuṇa identifications elude me.

VI.47.31: Ge explains pāda a persuasively as "Raub und Wiederraub der Kühe," with the 'yonder ones' (*amū́ḥ*) those belonging to the enemy and the ones here (*imā́ḥ*) our own.

I do not understand why *cáranti* is accented. Ge takes it as implicitly subordinated ("Wenn … sich sammeln"), which would account for the accent, but there's no other evidence for subordination. It could be ascribed to the vague principle that the verb is accented in a clause that provides the basis for the next clause, as Old suggests only to question (ZDMG 60: 725 n. 1 = KlSch. p. 200).

VI.48 Agni and Maruts

Renou treats this hymn in EVP XV (142–46).

VI.48.1: I take the two pādas of the first hemistich as entirely parallel, with an instr. āmreḍita followed by a dat. of benefit/purpose. Others (Ge, Re, Klein [āmreḍitas]) instead interpr. *dákṣase* as a infinitive or quasi-infinitive.

The 2nd hemistich has disharmony of number between the expressed subject, pl. *vayám*, and the 1st sg. verb *śaṃsiṣam*, a rare but not unheard-of phenomenon. Here we can link it to the āmreḍitas that dominate the vs., esp. the doubled preverb *prá-pra*, in tmesis from the finite *śaṃsiṣam*. Perhaps this serves as a sort of individuating feature: "I after I …," that is, "we." This cannot be conveyed in Engl., though I admit that the publ. tr. "we — that is, I —" is itself barely English.

VI.48.2: The first hemistich of this vs. is problematic. First, the acc. phrase *ūrjó nápātam* referring to Agni should be (and indeed must be) the obj. of *dā́śema* 'we would ritually serve', but this DIR.OBJ + VERB sequence is interrupted by a parenthetical nominal clause apparently referring to Agni in the nominative (*sá … ayám*). Further, the make-up of the complex *hinā́yám* is much discussed. As it happens, I devoted a brief article to just this expression ("RV *sá hinā́yám* (VI.48.2) with a Return Visit to *nā́yám* and *nā́nā*," Fs. H. H. Hock, 2013). There I suggest that the proper segmentation is **hí nā́ ayám*, with the particle *hí*, which has lost its accent in the confusion, the nom. sg. *nā́* to *nár-* 'man', a form otherwise not found independently until the Amarakośa, extracted from the old āmreḍita *nā́-nā* 'man after man', used adverbially to mean 'every man for himself, on his own', plus the near deictic *ayám*. Alternative views are discussed in the art. cit.

VI.48.3: The second hemistich has two alliterative etymological figures: c *śocíṣā śóśucac chuce* and d *sudītíbhiḥ sú dīdihi*. The second is esp. nice, with *su-* 'good' as the first cmpd. member echoed by *sú* the independent particle.

VI.48.4: Pāda a juxtaposes two 2nd sg. forms of √*yaj*, the indic. pres. *yájasi* and the *-si*-impv. *yákṣi*, in separate clauses. This juxtaposition presumably accounts for the accent on *yájasi*.

In d the obj. must be *vā́jā*, extracted from *vā́jotá*. Grammatically this should be a dual, but a dual is semantically unlikely (Old "Dual *vā́jā* ist gewiss nicht anzunehmen"). Best to take it as a pseudo-/nonce neut. pl. For the phrase cf. (as Ge does) I.48.11 *vā́jaṃ hí*

váṃsva; on this basis it is likely that *vā́jā* is obj. of both *rāsva* and *váṃsva*, although the position of *utá* associates it esp. with *rāsva*.

VI.48.5: On *píprati* as 'carry to term', a specialization of 'carry to the far shore', see comm. ad I.156.3, also in a birth context. Most take it as belonging to 'fill' (Gr, Re), while Ge tr. 'nähren' and considers it a blend of the two roots √*pṝ* (n. 5ab). Rather than assigning it to 'fill', I prefer to think that it participates in a word play with *papraú* 'has filled' in the next vs. (6a).

VI.48.9: Although *ūtyā́* could be taken with the impv., the instr. of *ūtí-* has a robust relationship with *citrá-* elsewhere (e.g. I.172.1, II.17.8, IV.23.2, VI.10.5, VI.26.5).

   vidā́ in the Saṃhitā text can represent either a lengthened form of the impv. *vida* or a subj. *vidāḥ* (so Pp., also Gr, Lub). Both Ge and Re tr. as an impv. (as do I), which fits the imperatival tone of the hymn better than a subjunctive. Although neither Gr nor Lub gives other imperatives to this stem, most of the forms analyzed as *vidāḥ* are better taken as imperatives like this one (e.g., I.36.14, 71.7, VIII.61.7).

   The particle *tú*, which ordinarily takes standard 2nd position, is out of place here. The same sequence, *tucé tú naḥ*, is also found in VIII.27.14, where it is also out of place. I have no explanation.

VI.48.10: *párṣi … partṛ́bhiḥ* "deliver to the further shore with deliverers" both continues the 'ford' motif of the last vs. and picks up the same verb in 5b, where it has more restricted semantics.

   Pādas b and c contain two different forms of √*yu* 'keep away': the negated adj. *áprayutvan-* lit. 'not distant / absent, not inattentive' and the impv. *yuyodhi*.

   Note the chiastic figure *héḷāṃsi daívyā ... [á]devāni hvárāṃsi ca*. The inner terms, *daívyā … ádevāni*, are of course etymologically related, but, though both neut. pl. *a*-stems, have different endings; the outer terms, *héḷāṃsi … hvárāṃsi* are paired only by their initial *h-* and their neut. pl. *s*-stem ending *-āṃsi*. The *ca* is of course misplaced: we would expect **ádevāni ca hvárāṃsi*. Klein (DGRV I.53) says that *ádevāni hvárāṃsi* "is treated as an indivisible unit, and *ca* is therefore displaced to third position," but this is a description, not an explanation. I would suggest that the poet didn't want to interrupt his pretty chiasmus. (The placement of *ca* also enables an iambic finish to the pāda, whereas the expected order would not, but I doubt if this is the major reason.)

VI.48.11–13: On these three vss., see publ. intro.

VI.48.11: On *návyasā vácaḥ* # see comm. ad VIII.39.2, I.26.2.

VI.48.12: The publ. tr. renders *dhúkṣata* as if it were a subjunctive ("will milk out"; sim. Ge) to an *s*-aor., but the form must be an injunctive to a *sa*-aor., given the augmented forms *ádhukṣata*, etc., and the sec. ending *-ta*. Of course, the injunc. could be used modally, but a presential "who milks out" might be better.

VI.48.13: With Ge I take *dhukṣata*, identical save for the accent to *dhúkṣata* in 12b, as a 2nd pl. act. impv., not a 3rd sg. mid. injunc. In a n. (13a) Ge allows the possibility of the latter analysis, which would produce the paradox that a cow is milking a cow. Re opts for this latter analysis -- the cow milking herself. Although I am always quick to see paradox in the RV, in this case I think the poet is playing with morphology instead, while bringing the final vs. of this 3-vs. sequence back to the 2nd pl. impvs. of vs. 11.

Note the direct object in balanced coordination, NOUN *ca* ADJ / NOUN *ca* ADJ, with both *ca*-s properly positioned (unlike 10cd above) and with each bahuvrīhi epithet having the shape *viśvá-C*o*Casam*.

VI.48.14–19: On these Pūṣan vss., see publ. intro.

VI.48.14: Despite the change in topic, *sṛprá-bhojasam* (a) responds to *viśvá-bhojasam*, which ends the previous vs. (13c).

The enclitic *vaḥ* in Wackernagel's position in pāda a must wait for the verb *stuṣe* towards the end of d to find its syntactic niche. It refers, as usual, to the fellow priests on whose behalf the poet will praise the god. Ge's "Diesen euren (Gott)" (sim. Re), attempting to find a function for it within the first pāda, is unnecessary.

This vs. contains four gods to whom Pūṣan is compared and four adjectives. It is therefore not surprising that both Ge and Re distribute one adjective per god. My tr. differs: it honors the pāda boundary between c and d, which sequesters the two-adjective sequence *mandrám sṛprábhojasam* in the pāda with Aryaman, leaving Viṣṇu shorn of any epithet. This decision wasn't made only on the basis of the pāda boundary (which would be weak evidence), but also because *sṛprá-bhojas-* 'providing lush nourishment' is an adjective more appropriate to the hospitable Aryaman than to Viṣṇu. See Thieme, Fremdling 105, 143; M+A 83. By contrast, Viṣṇu and Pūṣan are often mentioned next to each other, almost as if interchangeable (e.g. VI.17.11, VIII.54.5, with the pāda-opening *pūṣā víṣṇuḥ*) and without descriptors.

The final infinitival *ādíśe* can be taken in a number of ways: Ge (fld. by Scar 221–22) rather whimsically as "um (ihm) einen Wink zu geben," while Re instead gives "pour attirer-son-attention." I do not think it can be separated from the two forms of *ā̆ √diś* (including vs.-final *ādíśe* as here) in the nearby Pūṣan hymn VI.56.1. In that vs. I take the lexeme as meaning 'designate (X as Y=epithet)', and I think something similar is meant here: by giving Pūṣan attributes and identifying him with various gods I've uniquely identified him.

VI.48.15: This vs. not only continues the identification of Pūṣan with other gods -- here the Maruts, characterized by three different descriptors -- but is syntactically dependent on the previous vs. and its verb *stuṣe*. It also contains the first mention of Pūṣan himself (pāda b), at the end of the series of identifications.

The three adjectives, *tveṣám*, *tuviṣváṇi*, and *anarvā́nam*, must qualify both the *śárdhaḥ* 'troop' of the Maruts, a neut. acc. *s*-stem, in the simile, and *pūṣáṇam*, a masc. acc. -*n*-stem, in the frame. They seem to split the difference with regard to gender: *tveṣám* is of course ambiguous as to gender, but *tuviṣváṇi* is neut. and *anarvā́nam* masc. The latter is

adjacent to masc. *pūṣáṇam* and separated by the pāda boundary from the neut. phrase, so it is not surprising that it would adopt a masc. form. Moreover, a proper neut. acc. to this stem would be *anarvá, which almost fatally obscures the 2nd member of the bahuvrīhi. The same substitution of masc. acc. *anarvāṇam* for expected neut. *anarvá- is found with the very same neut. acc. referent *śárdho mārutam* in I.37.1; cf. comm. there. The expected neut. NA presumably underlies the them. adj. *anarvá*-; see comm. ad I.185.3. Ge's and Re's strategy of taking *anarvāṇam* as only modifying Pūṣan (e.g., Ge "den unerreichten Pūṣan, der …") is thus both unnecessary and probably wrong, given its application (not in a simile) to the Marut troop in I.37.1.

VI.48.16: The little nominal clause *aghā aryó árātayaḥ* with its unremarkable sentiment ("evil are the hostilities of the stranger") may have been a popular saying, as it's found in the same form nearby in VI.59.8, an Indra-Agni hymn. It is not clear to me why Pūṣan would care or why the speaker seems to impart it as a secret.

VI.48.17: This vs. seems to continue the poet's direct speech to Pūṣan, and if it is meant to be a secret, it will remain so: as noted in the publ. intro. the vs. is close to unintelligible. My interpr. differs markedly from those of others (or rather, from that of others: Re and Klein [DGRV I.289] basically follow Ge; Old, however, differs from them in cd, suggesting several other alternatives, none of which he stands behind).

   The first pāda is deceptively straightforward, at least syntactically. It is a prohibition against uprooting a particular kind of tree. The tree name, however, is a hapax, with un-Ārya phonology (*kākambīra*- with plain *b*), and why this tree should be left in the ground is unsaid. As for the word, it's possible that it's a partial scrambling of Pūṣan's epithet *karambhād*- 'gruel-eater' (VI.56.1), but even if so, it doesn't get us anywhere.

   The next pāda shows some word-order disturbances that cause me to interpret it differently from the standard and in fact to make a small emendation to the text. The text as transmitted reads *áśastīr ví hí nīnaśaḥ*, with, apparently, a preverb in tmesis in 2nd position (*ví*) and the particle *hí* in 3rd position. Both of these would be quite unusual, though it must be admitted that in this kind of informal speech we might expect deviations from normal order. The *hí* also suggests that the pāda offers the causal grounds for either the preceding clause or the following one. Ge and Re choose the former option, but I don't see how pāda a follows from pāda b as rendered by them, at least given our ignorance of significance of the Kākambīra tree. To address the word-order problems I suggest that instead of *ví hí* we read *vihí, the 2nd sg. impv. to √*vī* 'pursue'. (An asterisk should be inserted in the publ. tr. before 'pursue'.) Although this impv. is more often *vīhí* with long root vowel (as in nearby VI.50.2), there are several exx. with short root vowel (e.g., III.21.5, where the short vowel is metrically favored and perhaps guaranteed). Given the obscurity of this vs., it would not be surprising if the puzzled redactors split the syllables and endowed *ví* with an accent as if it were a preverb. If my reading is accepted, we have either a sort of serial verb construction: "come on (and) destroy," or simply a chronological series: "pursue and destroy." The latter is reflected in the publ. tr. By my interpr. the redupl. aor. *nīnaśaḥ* is accented because it starts a new clause. Unfortunately I cannot explain why we have a redupl. aor. injunc. rather than a caus. impv. (*nāśaya) following the 1st impv.

My interpr. of the 2ⁿᵈ hemistich diverges from the standard even more, taking Klein's tr. (DGRV I.289) to stand also for Ge's and Re's: "And may the sun not (shine) for even a day for the one who grasps the neck of the bird." We all agree that *mótá* stands for *mā̆* + *utá*, with *utá* conjoining the two prohibitive particles in a and c. Beyond this, anyone confronting this hemistich must deal with several textual problems: 1) the meter of c is disturbed; in fact Old calls it "hoffnungslos"; 2) it is difficult to decide what underlies the transmitted sequence *áha evā̆*; the Pp. takes *áha* as *áhar*, but, needless to say, this sandhi would be unusual; 3) *evā̆* with long final is almost always pāda- or clause-initial, as opposed to generally 2ⁿᵈ-position *evá* (see Lub s.vv.). In fact, in Minkowski's detailed treatment of the two forms (JAOS 115.3 [1995]: 388–400) this particular passage is "the only one possible counterexample" (p. 391) to this rule of placement. (With Old, Minkowski floats the possibility that two syllables are missing after *áha*, producing an 8-syll. pāda, with *evā̆ caná* then pāda-initial in a 12-syl. one. Since it is impossible to know what those missing 2 syllables might have been and since, all things being equal, we'd prefer a Satobṛhatī vs. [see publ. intro.], which would have 12 8, not 8 12, as its 2ⁿᵈ half, I will deal with the text we have.) In addition to these formal problems, there are a few crucial lexical ambiguities: 1) *sūraḥ* can be nom. sg. of the thematic stem *sūra-* or gen./abl. sg. of the athem. stem *svàr-*; 2) as noted above, the underlying form of *áha* is unclear: does it belong somehow to the 'day' word (*áhar, áhan-*) or is it the asserverative particle *áha*? 3) *véḥ*, which should be read as a disyllable, can be a case forms of the 'bird' word (*ví-*), either nom. or gen./abl. sg., or a verb form to √*vī* 'pursue'. The standard interpr. presented above chooses the first of each of those lexical alternatives; in all instances I choose the 2ⁿᵈ.

The standard tr., with 'sun' as subject, supplies 'shine' as the verb; no justification is given by anyone who so interprets it (as far as I've been able to find). My interpr. attempts to find some clues in context. There are a few; whether they are false trails or not I cannot be certain. The first is the verb of pāda a, which is presented as parallel to pāda c by the *mā̆* … *mótá* construction. The verb is *úd* √*vṛh* 'tear up'. Various forms of √*vṛh* are found in the often puzzling "wheel of the sun" myth, describing the ripping off of this wheel. Cf. I.130.9 *sūraś cakrám prá vṛhat* …; I.174.5 *prá sūraś cakrám vṛhatād abhī́ke* [=IV.16.2]; V.29.10 *prānyác cakrám avṛhaḥ sūryasya*. In two of these three passages the gen. sg. of 'sun' is *sūraḥ*. Although this is slender evidence, it is, at least, evidence (as opposed to the random fantasy of the standard tr.), and I therefore borrow the verb √*vṛh* from pāda a and supply 'wheel' as its obj., with a dependent gen. *sūraḥ*. This is supported by a nearby passage in a Pūṣan hymn, VI.56.3 *utā́dáḥ paruṣé gávi, sūraś cakrám̐ hiraṇyáyam / ny àirayad rathī́tamaḥ* "And yonder golden wheel of the Sun he set down in the 'gray cow' -- he the best charioteer." (This is the same hymn that contains the form *ādíśe* disc. above ad vs. 14.) It is not at all clear what story that passage is telling, but we *can* see that Pūṣan, who is our addressee here, changes the placement of a detached "wheel of the sun," with the sun-genitive *sūraḥ* as here. The detachment might results from tearing the wheel off the chariot of the sun. This chain of reasoning accounts for my tr. of the first part of pāda c: "And certainly don't (tear off the wheel) of the sun." I am taking *áha* as the particle, not a form of 'day' (though 'day' could be worked into that tr.). Of course this interpr. does not solve the sandhi problem: we should expect *áhaivā̆*. But if a new clause begins with *evā̆*, as I think it does, the unusual sandhi break would be more understandable.

Starting a new clause solves the problem of non-initial *evá* noted above. But what is the content of the clause? Like the standard tr., I take *ādádhate* as a dat. sg. pres. act. participle, with *grīvāḥ* 'necks' as object. However, I do not think this refers to the neck(s) of a/the bird. Instead, as noted above, I take *véḥ* as a verb form to √ *vī*; given my emendation in pāda b to **vihí*, *véḥ* to the same root would follow naturally (or as naturally as we're going to get in this vs.). Given its disyllabic reading, I take it as standing for **váyas*, the 2nd sg. subjunctive to the root present. I'm assuming that Pūṣan wants to give chase to (or at least follow) whoever does whatever he's doing to the necks, and if he (Pūṣan) tears off the wheel of the sun, he won't be able to. As for *grīvāḥ* √ *dhā*, I conjecture that this describes one action in the harnessing of horses to the chariot. Note √ *dhā* in VII.34.4 *ấ dhūrṣú asmai dádhātāśvān* "Put the horses to the chariot poles for him," and recall that the horse Dadhikrā is "bound at the neck" (*grīvāyām baddháḥ*) in IV.40.4. But the "place necks" phrase is open to multiple possibilities, none of which imposes itself.

There are a couple of grammatical loose ends in this extremely loosely constructed interpr.: 1) dative complements are rare to √ *vī*, 2) *véḥ* is accented, though there's no obvious trigger for the accent. It may be that it borrowed the accent from my putative **vihí*, or that the implied causal dependency of the *evá* clause (thus my "for thus never …") induced it. Or that the redactors had no idea what this meant (a mental confusion we share) and took it as a form of 'bird'.

To lay out my reasoning in detail is, I realize, not necessarily to convince -- but at least there *is* reasoning every step of the way. I challenge other interpr. to provide the same!

VI.48.18: Ge and Re take the comparison to be between the partnership and the leather bag (e.g., Ge "Deine … Freundschaft soll sein wie der … Schlauch"), but the partnership is in the nom. (*sakhyám*) and the bag is in the gen. (*dŕteḥ*), as is Pūṣan (*te*). Given the deep uncertainty of this part of the hymn, grammar is all we have to hold onto, and grammar tells us that it is Pūṣan who is compared to the bag. For the partnership with Pūṣan, see I.138.4fg.

VI.48.21: Ge and Re take the rel. cl. of ab as unconnected with the rest of the vs. But surely the *yásya* refers to Indra, as is made clear by the 'Vṛtra-smashing' references in de.

The adj. *vṛtrahám*, twice modifying neut. *śávaḥ* (d, e), is attributed to a hapax thematic stem *vṛtra-há-* by Gr (see also Re's comm.), beside the very well-attested root noun cmpd. *vṛtra-hán-*. Although this analysis must be synchronically correct, I wonder if the form here has not been re-marked from the expected neut. to the root noun, which should probably be **vṛtra-há*. See disc. of *satrā-hám* ad V.35.4 and also of *anarvám* ad I.185.3. The re-marking must already have happened and the thematic stem extracted before the composition of this passage, since the *-am* ending makes position in the cadence.

VI.48.22: The first half of this vs. is straightforward: both Heaven and Earth were born only once. The same "only once" (*sakŕt*) appears in pāda c as well, but with the mention of Pṛśni things get complicated, esp. when pāda d is taken into account. The hemistich reads *pŕśnyā dugdhám sakŕt páyas, tád anyó nǎnu jāyate*. Pāda c is unproblematically "only once was the milk of Pṛśni milked." Ge takes the milk here to be, symbolically, the Maruts; the point of the pāda is that Pṛśni "ward nur einmal Mutter." (In this I think he is correct.) His d is

"Nach dem wird kein anderer geboren" (sim. Re "(nul) autre ne naît à la suite de (tout) cela"), both with an indefinite reading of *anyáḥ* as '(no) other'; the publ. tr. also has an indefinite reading, but limited to the Maruts -- that is, the Maruts were born all at once and no other Maruts followed: "Another (of the Maruts) is not born after this." But all of these interpr., however easily they go down, should be wrong. As I have demonstrated at length ("Vedic *anyá-* 'another, the other': syntactic disambiguation," Fs. Beekes, 1997, pp. 11–18), indefinite and definite readings of *anyá-* are distinguished positionally: 2nd position *anyá-*, as here, is definite. (For a clear ex. see in the next hymn VI.49.3b with an *anyá- … anyá-* "the one … the other" construction.) Our pāda d should mean "*the other* is not born after this." This passage needs to be considered in conjunction with VI.66.1 *márteṣv anyád doháse pīpāya, sakŕc chukráṃ dudhe pŕśnir ū̆dhaḥ*, whose 2nd pāda is very close to our pāda c. VI.66.1 has an implicit *anyá- … anyá-* construction: the *anyád* in the 1st pāda refers to Pṛśni's udder and is contrasted with the *ū̆dhaḥ* in the 2nd pāda, which invites a reading with a second **anyád*. The publ. tr. renders this "while the one stays swollen to give milk to mortals, only once did Pṛśni milk the gleaming (milk/semen) from (the other) udder."

VI.66.1 is only limited help, however. Although its 2nd pāda is, as just noted, semantically and formulaically very comparable to our first, and its first pāda contains a form of *anyá-* as our 2nd one does, there are several important discrepancies: the *anyá-* in VI.66.1 is neut. and therefore pairs easily with the *ū̆dhaḥ* of the following pāda, but our passage contains a masc. *anyáḥ* which cannot be directly referred to the (neut.) milked *páyaḥ* of the preceding passage nor to Pṛśni's (neut.) udder, which must be lurking in the passage too. Moreover, though the *sakŕt* pādas of our vs. (abc) refer to a discrete event *in the past*, the verb of d, the *anyá-* pāda, is present (*ánu jāyate*).

I can see two ways of handling this problematic pāda, an easy one and a hard one. In the easy one I ignore my own rule about *anyá-* placement and take *anyáḥ* as indefinite, with a tr. similar to Ge/Re: "no other is born following this" / "another is not born following this." The publ. tr. "Another (of the Maruts) is not born after this" was adapted from von Bradke (Fs. Roth 118) and was an attempt to limit the scope of indefinite 'other' to "other Maruts" and therefore wring a semi-definite sense out of it. But that's a cop-out: it's still indefinite, and the more general rendering of Ge/Re may be more satisfactory if we are going the indefinite route.

Although this is the easier alternative, I am not at all sure it's the wrong one -- though I'm reluctant to toss out the *anyá-* rule without a struggle. The harder way makes reference to yet another desperate Pṛśni udder passage, this one II.34.2: *rudró yád vo marutaḥ …, vŕ̥ṣājani pŕśnyāḥ śukrá ū̆dhani* "when Rudra was begotten for you as the blazing bullish (semen = rain?) in the udder of Pṛśni, o Maruts." For the difficulties of this passage and my interpr. of it, see comm. ad loc. The passage refers, in my view, to the birth (or *a* birth) of the Maruts' father Rudra, which "birth" then led to the birth of the Maruts. Acdg. to this passage, Rudra took shape ("was born") as "bullish semen" in Pṛśni's udder. As I say in my comm. ad loc., "It is this semen that combines with Pṛśni to produce the Maruts; it can also, in naturalistic terms, be the rain in the thunderclouds that are Pṛśni's udder. This gender mingling and loss of distinction between the Maruts' bull-father (=Rudra) and their mother Pṛśni in the udder are also found, in somewhat different fashion, in IV.3.10d *vŕ̥ṣā śukráṃ duduhe pŕ̥ṣnir ū̆dhaḥ* 'the bull as Pṛśni milked gleaming

(milk/semen) from his (/her) udder' and in VI.66.1d *sakŕc chukrám duduhe pŕṣnir ŭdhaḥ* 'only once did Pŕśni milk the gleaming (milk/semen) from the udder.'"

I now think it possible (though only that) that the masc. *anyá-* of our passage refers to Rudra (and/or his semen); in that case the referent is definite (as my rule requires), and the pāda means "The other [=Rudra] is not born after this," in other words, the normal order of nature prevails: the father/semen was born in Pŕśni's udder before the sons, the Maruts, who resulted from the mingling of those essences and who were "milked out" of that udder -- a bit of an anticlimax, to be sure: we wouldn't in fact expect Rudra's birth to follow his sons'. I am not sure that this is the correct way to interpret the passage, but it does conform to the known syntactic rules and also has suggestive connections with other troubling passages involving the same features: Rudra, his semen, Pŕśni, her udder, her milk, and the Maruts.

VI.49 All Gods

The verb 'quicken, enliven' (√*jinv*) appears at widely scattered intervals in this hymn (6b *jinvatam*, 11c *jínvathā*, 14d *jinvatu*), but enough to count as a leitmotif.

VI.49.1: Although non-formulaic groupings of gods are frequently encountered in All God hymns, the trio *váruṇo mitró agníḥ* is perhaps a little strange, since we expect this trio's third member to be instead Aryaman. And indeed that sequence is quite common: there is a much-repeated dimeter pāda *váruṇo mitró aryamā* (I.26.4, etc.; see repetitions listed in Lub), and the same sequence is regularly found at the end of a Jagatī pāda (I.40.5, V.46.5, VII.66.11, 12, etc.). I wonder if *agníḥ* is some sort of makeshift substitute for *aryamā* in a Triṣṭubh cadence where *aryamā* wouldn't fit (cf. the same sequence in the acc. in the next hymn, VI.50.1, and it is found elsewhere in both nom. and acc., incl. the repeated pāda VI.51.10). After all, Agni is compatible with pretty much any Vedic god and could be slotted in when the more specialized divinity was metrically inconvenient.

VI.49.2: The fuller expression in X.3.7 *diváspŕthivyór aratír yuvatyóḥ* "the spoked wheel of Heaven and Earth, the youthful ones" makes the identity of "the two youthful ones" clear.

Ge and Re take *yájadhyai* as a predicated infinitive with unexpressed subject "I" (without comment), with Agni the obj.: "… Agni … will ich verehren"; "je veux lui sacrifier." I instead supply "(I invoke)" (parallel to *stuṣé* 'I will praise' in 1a) to govern *agním*, who is then the subject of the inf. Although this involves supplying material, elsewhere in Agni contexts this infinitive is generally used of him, as subject, in his priestly role. Cf., e.g., III.1.1 … *mā* … *váhniṃ cakartha vidáthe yájadhyai* "you have made me your draught-horse, to offer the sacrifice at the ritual distribution." And in this hymn see VI.49.9 *hótā yakṣat … agníḥ* "the Hotar Agni will sacrifice," with Agni as agent-subject of the active verb.

VI.49.3: My tr. of *sŭro anyā* "the other is the sun's" follows Old, who adopted it from Ludwig. Ge (/Re) supply an instr. *raśmíbhiḥ* 'with the rays', parallel to *stŕbhiḥ*, on which *sŭraḥ* depends. This seems unnec. Re's claim that the accent on *pipiśé* "déconseille l'interprétation de *sŭraḥ* donnée par Old." does not convince: although by the Old reading

pipiśé is not part of both *anyā́* clauses as it would be with the additional instr., it occurs at the boundary of two explicitly contrastive clauses, which would, I think, be sufficient to induce accent.

VI.49.5: Note the tricky word positioning, with pāda-final *yáḥ* picking up pāda-init. *sá*, in a nominal rel. cl. continued in the next pāda. It may be that in a structurally simple hymn like this the poet seeks to vary the ways he introduces the listed divinities and their attributes and to jazz up the syntax.

VI.49.6: If my comment immed. above is correct, this vs. is a fine example of it. To begin with the surface, the first hemistich has a dual voc. (*párjanyavātā*) and a dual impv. (*jinvatam*). So far all is well. But the 2nd hemistich has a plural voc. (*sátyaśrutaḥ kavayaḥ*), whose referents are not identified, and a singular voc. (*jágata sthātar*), whose referent is not identified, flanking a rel. prn. in the gen. and an instr. pl. (*yásya gīrbhíḥ*), with the rest of the vs., following the singular voc., containing an apparent main cl. verb in the 2nd pl. (*ā́ kṛṇudhvam* [so Pp.]). The simplest thing to do is to disjoin the two half-verses, keeping the dual and plural parts separate. But that leaves us with an incomplete rel. cl. that has nothing to do. The problems are discussed at length by Old, though he does not come to a firm determination.

    Both Ge and Re take the first hemistich as independent, as do Old and Scar (556). By contrast, I consider it the main cl. on which cd is dependent. Since my interpr. of ab resembles theirs almost to the end, however, we are in happy agreement so far. For the connection of Parjanya and Vāta with the *púrīṣāni … ápyāni* "watery outpourings," cf. X.65.9 *parjányāvātā vr̥ṣabhā́ puriṣíṇā*. The only question is whether *pr̥thivyā́ḥ* in our passage depends on *vr̥ṣabhā́* or the watery outpourings: its accent (as opposed to unaccented voc. *vr̥ṣabhā*) speaks (weakly: see Old comm.) for the latter, the pāda break for the former, and the consensus is for the former. I'm not at all sure it matters.

    In my interpr. of ab as the main cl. to cd, I supply a beneficial dat. "for him," referring to the human poet, to serve as main cl. referent for the rel. *yásya* in c. As just noted, the standard interpr. take ab as an independent cl., and therefore must account for the rel. prn. *yásya* in a different way. Before tackling that, let us first determine who the vocc. in cd refer to.

    The pl. voc. phrase *sátyaśrutaḥ kavayaḥ* beginning pāda c: by almost universal agreement, beg. with Sāy., this refers to the Maruts, on the basis of the pāda-spanning voc. phrase *sátyaśrutaḥ kávayaḥ yúvānaḥ* used of the Maruts in V.57.8, the only other occurrences of *satya-śrut-*. (It is worth remarking here that, though in both V.57.8 and here the pāda opens with the first two vocc., in V.57.8 *kávayaḥ* is accented, whereas here it is not. I have no explan.) The identification with the Maruts seems reasonable, though of course nothing about the phrase uniquely identifies the Maruts. However, note that in vs. 11 below they are addressed as *yuvānaḥ kavayaḥ*, with two of the terms found in V.57.8.

    As for *jágata sthātar* in d, most tr. leave the referent unidentified (e.g., Ge n. 6cd "Wer der *jágataḥ sthātar* sein soll, ist nicht deutlich."). Since the agent noun *sthātar-* in the sg. is otherwise used only of Indra, he seems a likely referent, esp. because he is also regularly associated with the Maruts. The added wrinkle is that there must be a pun here as

well: the stem *sthātár-* (so accented) 'the still', always in the form *sthātúḥ*, is the regular formulaic partner of *jágat-* 'the moving'; cf., e.g., in the next hymn, VI.50.7 *víśvasya sthātúr jágataḥ*. The poet's urge to make this play on words may have contributed both to the contorted syntax and the unclarity of reference we're trying to untangle.

The two referents of the vocative phrases, the Maruts and (if I'm right) Indra, are the joint 2nd pl. subjects of the verb in d. On this, I think, we are all agreed. But all standard interpr. follow the Pp. in taking *ā́ kṛṇudhvam* as an unaccented, and therefore main clause, verb. (See, explicitly, Old "… ist offenbar Imperativ und hat Hauptsatzakzent.") Under this interpr., something else has to be done with the *yásya gīrbhíḥ* of c. Most people supply material like mad: Ge adds a "towards him" in his main cl. and "you take pleasure" as verb in the rel. cl.: "machet alles was lebt, (dem) geneigt, an dessen Loblied (ihr Freude habt)" -- in other words, he manufactures most of the relative cl.; Scar similar, though he gives a wide choice of ways to fill out the rel. cl., thus demonstrating exactly how untethered this interpr. is: "durch dessen Lieder{ihr das könnt/ihr so heiss/ihr gepriesen werdet} (?)." Re, by contrast, eliminates the rel. cl. by folding it into a voc.: "(toi) par les paroles de qui (les chose se réalisent)" -- though it still requires extensive material to fill it out, again based on nothing.

My solution is to take *ā́ kṛṇudhvam* as the verb of the rel. cl.: the Saṃhitā text of course reads *ā́kṛṇudhvam*; it is only the Pp. that inserts a notional word space after *ā́*. If we instead interpr. the sequence as an augmented imperfect, with accent on the augment, that is, *ā́* + *ákṛṇudhvam* (which does not require emendation), we do not have to fill out the rel. cl., because it already has an accented verb and that verb has an object: "you made the moving world your own." This expression, *ā́* √*kṛ* (middle) + INSTR. has close parallels, one containing *gīrbhíḥ* as here: cf. I.77.2 *tám ū námobhir ā́ kṛṇudhvam* / X.6.5 *agním gīrbhír námobhir ā́ kṛṇudhvam*. In both those passages I tr. "attract here with reverence (and hymns)." The difference in interpr. may be ascribed to the fact that in our passage here, the gods are subj. and the hymns come from the human poet, whereas in the two passages just cited mortals are also the subj. However, I may want to rethink both of those passages, to "make him [/Agni] your own." Since in both passages Agni is the object, he does not have to be attracted here, since as the ritual fire he already *is* here.

Thus, by my interpr. all of cd is a rel. cl., dependent on a "for him" or the like to be supplied in the main cl. of ab. Note that both Ge. ("dem") and Scar. ("für ihn") must supply the same beneficial dative, but they do so with the supposed main cl. verb *ā́ kṛṇudhvam* in d. Although my interpr. produces an awk English tr., it accounts for the Sanskrit considerably better than the alternatives. What it means for the gods to "make the moving world their own" I'm not sure -- but perhaps the usual RVic notion that human praises strengthen the gods for their heroic deeds and, perhaps in this case, that these praises bring the gods and their human worshipers (part of the "moving world") into a closer relationship.

VI.49.7: After the syntactic pyrotechnics of the previous vs., this one comes as a relief. Because of the subjunctive *yaṃsat* ending the vs., I assume a modal value also for *dhāt* ending the first hemistich, as do Ge and Re.

VI.49.8: With most (Gr, Ge, Re), the publ. tr. takes the hapax *páripati-* as ultimately derived from √*pā* 'protect', not *páti-* 'lord'. However, this analysis has grave formal problems not solved by Re's cavalier "hapax tiré de *pā-* … mais influencé, pour la forme, par *páti*": it would be quite difficult to get a short-vowel root syllable *pa-* from √*pā* by any normal derivational process. I now think that it *is* a cmpd. of *-páti-*, even though Wackernagel's 'ringsum Herr' (AiG II.1.260) reflecting this analysis is not terribly satisfactory. My change of heart was occasioned by considering the first verse in the first hymn of the Pūṣan cycle that begins soon after this hymn, VI.53.1, whose first pāda ends *pathas pate* "o lord of the path." I would now tr. our passage, "the complete lord of every path." It might be worth noting that VI.53.1 also enlists Pūṣan's help with our *dhî-* 'visionary thought', as here.

Most take *vacasyā̆* as instr. sg. to the -*ā̆* stem *vacasyā̆-* 'eloquence', requiring a verb to be supplied (e.g., Ge "(preise ich)"). I instead interpr. it as 1st sg. act. to the denom. *vacasya-* (not otherwise found accented). There are two problems with my analysis: 1) the other two forms of the verb *vacasya-* are medial; 2) *vacasyā̆* is accented, though supposedly a main-cl. verb. The first is not too difficult: verbs of proclaiming/praising can be labile with regard to voice. The second is more problematic and might require me to follow the standard view, tr. "(I praise, vel sim.) with my eloquence." But see disc. of *vardháyā* in 10b, where I suggest that our *vacasyā̆* here is indeed a verb and has borrowed its verbal accent from *vardháyā*.

The phrase *kā̆mena kṛtáḥ* is used of Pūṣan also in nearby VI.58.3–4.

VI.49.10: The form *vardháyā* can be either 2nd sg. impv. (Gr, Ge) or 1st sg. subjunctive (Re). I opt for the latter, partly because there seem to be no other unambiguous impvs. addressed to priests/mortals in this hymn; the priestly/poetic function is represented by 1st sg. (e.g., *stuṣé* 1a) and 1st pl. (e.g., *huvema* pāda d this vs.) verbs. It is also accented despite pāda-medial position, presumably because it lies in the center of a balanced construction: *rudrám dívā … rudrám aktaú* "Rudra by day … Rudra by night." Given this accented, non-initial, 1st sg. subj., I wonder if *vacasyā̆* in 8a is in fact also a verb (as in my first analysis, represented in the publ. tr.) and has borrowed its accent from *vardháyā*.

Despite Ge' and Re's comments, considering 'separately' ('allein', 'à part') for *ŕ̥dhak* only to reject it, this must be the correct tr. In his n. 10d Ge cites II.33.4, where we hope not to anger Rudra by invoking him with an invocation shared with another god or gods. See comm. ad loc. The fact that Rudra's sons are addressed in the next vs. (11), as well as namelessly in 6cd (see above), might make the need for a separate invocation of Rudra all the more acute.

VI.49.11: The interpr. of *varasyā̆-* as somehow a deriv. of *vára-* 'wish', found, e.g., in Gr, Ge, and AiG II.2.244, is contextually understandable: Ge's "Kommet … zum Bittgesuch des Sängers" makes more immediate sense than my "come hither in response to the singer's longing for space," with "in response to" smuggled in to make the sentence somewhat more parsable. But there is no *váras-* to √*vṝ* 'wish, choose', whereas *váras-* means 'wide space', something that RVic poets often express a desire for. Re hesitates (his word), but opts for 'desire for space' and adduces the quite apposite I.181.9 *varivasyā̆ gṛṇānáḥ* "singing (to you) with a desire for space," comparable to our *gṛṇató varasyā̆*.

The causal relationship between c and ab, suggested by *hí* (c), is not straightforward. But in its only other occurrence (IV.51.3), *acitrá-* refers to a *place*, one without brightness, therefore by implication sterile and lifeless. Thus the desire for (positive) space expressed in b is contrasted with (negative) space that the Maruts can, nonetheless, bring to life.

I don't understand the point of d.

VI.49.12: This vs. contains two exx. of case disharmony between simile and frame, one each in ab and cd.

Though Gr takes *ájā* as a 2nd sg. impv., both Ge and Re interpr. it as a 1st sg. subjunctive, as do I. This would bring the count to three in this hymn, by my interpr. (8a, 10b, 12b).

This verb takes a straightforward acc. obj. *yūthā* 'herds' in the simile, as well as an adverbial acc. goal *ástam* 'home'. But in the frame it lacks an overt obj.: I supply 'praise', Ge 'Lied', Re 'mon hymne'. And the goal is the personal dative of the divinity (*vīrā́ya*, etc.).

The mismatch between simile and frame is greater in cd, and once again the simile is the more straighforwardly expressed. The poet exploits the syntactic ambiguity of intrans./trans. -*áya-* formations, in the form here of the redupl. aor. *pispṛsati* √ *spṛś* 'touch', meaning both 'make X [acc.] touch Y [acc./loc.]' and, notionally passive, 'make Y [acc.] touched by X [instr.]'. The simile uses the latter construction: "cause the firmament (acc. *nā́kam* = Y) to be touched by stars (instr. *stṛ́bhiḥ* =X). In the frame the X is the "inspired words" (*vípaḥ*, acc. pl.) and the Y is the body (*tanvì*, in the loc., an alternative case to the acc. in this construction). Both words and body are limited by genitives, referring to the poet (*vacanásya* 'of the speaker') and the god (*śrutásya* 'of the famed one'). For further disc. of the passage and of the phenomenon in general see my "Case Disharmony."

Our poet further muddies the waters by reversing the more common relationship between forms of √ *vip* and √ *vac*. The stem *vacaná-* 'speaking, speaker', referring to a person, is attested only 3x in the RV, whereas *vácas-* 'speech' is ubiquitous; the root noun *víp-* 'inspired (word[s])' is not uncommon, but is far outnumbered by the stem *vípra-* 'inspired poet'. So we might have expected the phrase *víprasya vácaḥ "the speech of the inspired poet" (cf., though not with a gen., VIII.61.9 *vípraḥ … vácaḥ*), not *vacanásya vípaḥ* "the inspired words of the speaker."

VI.49.13: Another syntactic trick, though far less complex than in the last vs. The first half-vs., describing Viṣṇu's cosmogonic deed, is couched in the 3rd ps., with the pf. *vimamé* 'he measured out', but in the 2nd half, expressing our present-day desire to live under Viṣṇu's protection, the god is in the more intimate 2nd ps., in the phrase *tásya te*, lit. "of this you," where *tásya* provides the syntactic pivot to 2nd sg. enclitic *te*. On such doublings see my "sa figé."

VI.49.15: The publ. tr. should read "the herds*man* of great truth," since *gopā́m* modifies *rayím*.

With Old I read *cakrámāma*, a pf. subj., not *ca krámāma*, *pace* Klein (DGRV I.188, 190). This reading is accepted by Kü (147 and n. 146).

I take *kṣáyam … yéna … abhí cakrámāma* as an explicit "X and (which) Y" construction on grounds of content: I do not think our "peaceful dwelling" (*kṣáyam*) is the means by which we will trample and destroy our enemies. Instead I think we have the usual RVic implicit contrast between war and peace (*yoga-kṣemá-* in one rendition), with 'peace' expressed by a noun and war by an elaborate rel. cl.

VI.50 All Gods

VI.50.1: The hymn begins with the 1st ps. mid. *huvé* 'I invoke/call upon', like the last hymn, which began (VI.49.1) *stuṣé* 'I will praise'.

On the ill-assorted trio Varuṇa, Mitra, Agni, see comm. ad VI.49.1. Here the phrase is in the acc., but likewise in a Triṣṭubh cadence. The expected Aryaman is added in the next pāda.

VI.50.2: It's not clear to me which gods Sūrya is supposed to pursue. The last descriptor, *agnijihvāḥ* 'having Agni as tongue' suggests it is, in fact, all the gods, since they all receive the oblation through him.

Note the juxtaposition of *ṛtá-* and *satyá-*; a similar of more elaborate ex. is found in the next hymn, VI.51.10 *ṛtádhītayo vakmarājasatyāḥ*.

VI.50.3: There is a surprising lack of agreement about the construction of this vs. Both Ge and Re take ab as a separate clause, which requires them to supply a verb for it ("ihr … besitzet"; "qui avez"). In cd they also both construe *maháḥ* in the *yathā* cl., but this is impossible, since it precedes the main verb *karathaḥ*. (I take *maháḥ* adverbially, as often and in 6d below [by my account].) See Old for a rather fussy disc. of various possibilities in cd. I do not see the problem with my interpr., which has *karathaḥ* in c govern the accusatives in ab, with a *yáthā* purpose cl. taking up most of cd (starting with *várivaḥ* right before the subord. conj.) This cl. lacks an overt verb, but an existential subjunctive *ásat* 'there will be' is easy to supply. (All interpr. must do something like this, unless they emend to accented **kárathaḥ*.) Ge (n. 3cd) worries about the tautology of … *no, asmé* …, which he avoids by construing *naḥ* with *maháḥ … várivaḥ* and *asmé* with the NP of d ("Machet, dass uns grosse Freibahn werde (und) unserem Wohnsitz Befreiung von allem Übel")(sim. Re), but I find the pronominal doubling far less troublesome than extracting a piece of the subord. clause and fronting it around the main verb, as the Ge/Re interpr. requires.

VI.50.5: Both Ge and Re take b as an indep. cl., while I interpr. it as a dependent clause parallel to pāda a, likewise hanging off *yéṣu*. Either is grammatically possible, since the verb of b *síṣakti* is pāda-initial and could owe its accent to that position. And in fact there's little actual difference in content between the two interpr., because both Ge and Re sneak the Maruts into the pāda anyway.

The more crucial question in b is the meaning of the hapax *abhyardhayájvan-*. Most take it as expressing a hostile, oppositional, or at least separated relationship, e.g., Ge "Gegenverehrer," AiG II.1.67 "gesondert opfern," Re "(dieu) recevant un sacrifice distinct." Certainly by the time of the BYV Saṃhitās, *abhyardhá-* (or *-ás*; see below) is used to mean

'apart from, separated from'; cf., e.g., MS II.5.4 (52: 14) … *yó rājanyò 'bhyardhó viśáś carati* "a Rājanya who goes about apart from his clan" (/ Amano "… der Rājanya, der von seinem Volk abseits wandeln"). (For Amano's interpr. of the form as an adv. in *-aḥ* and her detailed discussion of its use in this textual stratum, see her n. 2500 [that number is not a typo].) However, in the RV *árdha-* (and *ardhá-*) refers rather to a 'half' or a 'side'. In X.26.5, a passage adduced by Ge, Pūṣan is described as *prátyardhir yajñānām*, which even Ge tr. as "der bei den Opfern (mit den Göttern) halbpart macht" and Sāy. glosses *ardhabhak* 'half-sharer'. The point, I think, is that Pūṣan is almost always in partnership with other gods, indeed often in dvandvas like *índrā-pūṣán-* (cf. nearby VI.57.1), *somā-pūṣán-*, and the only sacrifices he is likely to receive will be shared with (an)other more prominent god or gods. In a way, this characterization of Pūṣan is the exact opposite of Rudra in the previous hymn (VI.49.10), where it is emphasized that Rudra receives a separate invocation, apart from the other gods. For Pūṣan's relationship to the Maruts, see nearby VI.48, where the Pūṣan vss. (14–19) are sandwiched between Marut vss. (11–13, 20–21) and Pūṣan is compared to the Marut troop (VI.48.15).

Compared to later texts, the gerund is comparatively rare in the RV; the *-tvā* gerund is found only 21x. The configuration of pāda c shows that the gerund phrase (*śrutvā hávam marutaḥ*) must constitute a separate syntactic unit here, since the subord. conj. *yád* occurs only after the whole phrase, and it is followed by 2nd-position part. *(d)ha*.

VI.50.6: The publ. tr. omits the *íd*. I might emend it to "Just he will hear the call."

In cd I take *ca* as "inverse" *ca* (X *ca* … Y, rather than normal X … Y *ca*) connecting the two very similar participial phrases … *úpa ca stávānaḥ*, … *úpa mahó gṛṇānáḥ*# "being praised and being hymned." Klein (DGRV I.122–23, 125, 173) by contrast takes it as conjoining the verbs of the two clauses, *śrávat* and *rāsat* in the configuration #*śrávat … úpa ca stávāno, rāsat …*), but placed after the preverb of the verbal lexeme in the 2nd clause (that is, by his interpr. *úpa ... rāsat*). Since *úpa* never appears otherwise with √*rā* but is quite common with √*stu*, this interpr. seems unlikely.

As noted above (ad 3c), I take *maháḥ* as the adverbially used *-s*-stem, against the standard view that it is a masc. acc. pl. (to the stem *máh-*) modifying *vājān*. The standard view is not impossible, but given the paired *úpa* … PART construction, word order favors taking *maháḥ* as part of the 2nd participle phrase.

VI.50.8–10: These three vss. contain a series of perfect optatives, *jagamyāt* (8b), *vavṛtyāt* (9b), *jagmyātam* (10a), but they do not show any peculiarities of register or usage. The connection among the vss. is also signaled by *utá*, which opens the second two. Klein (DGRV I.424) notes the co-occurrence of the "optative series" (he does not mention that they are belong to the pf.) and the *utá*'s.

VI.50.8: With Ge and Re, I take the simile *uṣáso ná prátīkam* as a nominative phrase, matching the subject Savitar. Since the dakṣiṇās are distributed at dawn and Dawn is therefore associated with munificence, her face (= her light) can be characterized as a discloser of valuables. However, it would also be grammatically possible to take it as acc.,

with Savitar disclosing valuables as if disclosing the face of Dawn, though I think this less likely.

VI.50.9: "within (the sphere of)" is an attempt to render the loc. *rātaú*, since "Might I always be in your giving" is hard to parse. Klein's (DGRV I.422) "Might I be ever (present) at thy giving" is more elegant. I might emend the publ. tr. to "Might I always be (there) at your giving."

VI.50.10: This vs. poses several syntactic problems. In ab the position of *aṅgá* speaks against taking the full hemistich as a single cl. (so, more or less, Klein DGRV I.422). Since *aṅgá* otherwise invariably takes 2nd position, it should not be found this deep in the clause; moreover the immediately preceding personal prn. *yuvám*, also encourages an interpr. as a new cl. Both Ge and Re do divide the sequence into two clauses, but both include *dhībhíḥ* in the 2nd clause -- which essentially defeats the purpose of the clause division, since *aṅgá* is still in the wrong position, just not as wrong as if the whole thing were one clause. Their solution is understandable because it could allow them to avoid taking *viprā* as a predicated vocative. So Re "car vous êtes (donneurs) de pensées-poétiques, ô inspirés!" with *viprā* as real voc. Ge's interpr. seems to combine the worst of both worlds — including *dhībhíḥ* in the 2nd cl. despite the position of *aṅgá* and taking *viprā* as a predicated voc. (see his n. 10b): "gerade ihr seid redebegabt mit (guten) Gedanken." My interpr. limits the 2nd cl. to *yuvám aṅgá viprā*, which imposes a predicated voc. but honors the position of the particle.

      The second hemistich is even more problematic. The standard tr. interpret the sequence as a *clausal* simile / frame construction, with different verbs in the simile and the frame, *(a)mumuktam* (simile) … *tū́rvatam* (frame), and *ná* marking the first *clause* as a simile. Cf., e.g., Klein (DGRV I.422–23) "As ye <u>freed</u> Atri from great darkness, (so) <u>cause</u> (us) <u>to pass out</u> of difficulty …" (my emphasis). But such constructions *do not exist* in the RV among the hundreds and hundreds of examples of similes in that text: similes are only nominal, and if a verb is implicitly part of it, it is held constant between simile and frame. See my detailed disc. in "Case Disharmony." The only possible examples that approach such a clausal construction are those providing a model and the action to be based upon it, but the very few such exx. we have involve *yáthā … evá* "just as …, even so …" — as in a childbirth spell: V.78.7 (cf. also 8) *yáthā vā́taḥ puṣkaríṇīṃ, samiṅgáyati sarvátaḥ / evá te gárbha ejatu* "<u>As</u> the wind sways a lotus-pond in every direction, <u>so</u> let your unborn child stir." These conditions are not met here, and I think it a methodologically dangerous practice to posit an entirely unprecedented construction on the basis of a single ambiguous passage.

      The way to a solution begins with the first verb, which is realized as *amumuktam* in the Pp. The only evidence for the augment is the avagraha in the printed Saṃhitā text(s): *'mumuktam*; the sandhi conditions do not require the augment. In fact Gr lists the form as unaugmented, and Old gets it right (in my view) the first time: "wie den Atri von der grossen Finsternis, (so) löset (mich ...)." But he then, unfortunately, has second thoughts, and although he recognizes that "*ná* nicht Satzvergleichungspartikel ist," he decides that *ná* can sometimes overstep its boundaries and function like a clausal simile marker (not his term). The single ex. he cites (VII.58.3), however, does not show what he claims it shows, at

least in my opinion, and it is also not like our passage, in that even by his interpr. the two clauses would have the same verb (in diff. mood and voice: *ví tirāti, … prá … tireta*). Whether Ge, Re, and/or Klein were influenced by Old's arguments or not, they all follow the clausal interpr., which I hope I have shown is unacceptable.

My own interpr. is identical to Old's first pass, with impv. *mumuktam* and a supplied 'me' as obj., parallel to *átrim* in the simile. As for the second verb, I follow Gotō (1ˢᵗ Kl., 163 n. 258) in taking *tūrvataṃ narā* as a parenthetical clause. This allows the abl. phrase at the end of d, *duritād abhīke* "from difficulty at close quarters," to be construed with *mumuktam*, parallel to the abl. *mahás támasaḥ* "from great darkness" in the simile. However, if the parenthetical interpr. seems too awkward, it might be possible to take d as a single, separate cl.: "be victorious from difficulty at close quarters," though *tūrv* seems not to take an abl. elsewhere.

VI.50.11: The only problems in this vs. are found in pāda d: the accented verb *mṛḷátā* and the immediately following *ca*: the verb because there is no obvious reason for its accent, the *ca* because it's not clear what it conjoins. To begin with the second, Klein (DGRV I.82), flg. Ge, takes *ca* as conjoining the impv. *mṛḷátā* with the pres. part. *daśasyántaḥ* beginning c, assuming an implicit imperatival expression *daśasyántaḥ *sta* "seid gefällig und erbarmet euch" / "(be) favoring and have mercy." Re, by contrast, seems to assume that the *ca* conjoins the last in the series of nom. pl., *divyāḥ pārthivaso, gójātā ápyāḥ*, judging by his "… et (vous enfin) nés des eaux," though this would require an unprecedented displacement of *ca* to the right, with the verb inserted between the last nominal term and the *ca*. Between these two ad hoc solutions, the first seems distinctly better than the 2ⁿᵈ. To register it, I should perhaps emend the tr. to "(Be ones) showing favor … and be merciful," despite the clunkiness.

The verbal accent is -- or may be -- less of a problem. If we do assume that the *daśasyántaḥ* stands for an imperatival clause, then *mṛḷátā* would begin a new clause. Although neither Ge nor Klein mentions the accent on the verb, it would be an argument in favor of their analysis. However, if we take the participle simply as the participle it appears to be, then it modifies the implicit subject of *mṛḷátā* and the verb should not be accented. There could be another way to get the accent in that case, though it seems artificial (or rather, even more artificial than the other suggestion). The sequence of four nom. pl. noted above is divided across two pādas, as shown by the comma in the quoted sequence. Only the first two have to be nominatives rather than vocatives: *divyāḥ* because of its non-initial accent, *pārthivāsaḥ* because it is accented in the middle of a pāda. The following two, the first two words of d, *could* be vocatives, accented because they are initial in the pāda. They would then match the undoubted voc. *devāḥ* at the end of the same pāda. If *gójātā ápyāḥ* are vocatives, then the immediately following word *mṛḷátā* would need to be accented after these extra-sentential elements. However, this analysis requires the unappealing step of assuming an unsignaled change of case from nominative to vocative in the middle of an apparently unitary sequence.

After all this syntactic fuss, we may overlook the interesting question, who are the "cow-born" gods (who appear elsewhere, in similar sequence [VII.52.14, cf. also X.53.5]).

Quite possibly the Maruts, an offhand suggestion of Re's. Remember their cow-mother Pṛśni.

VI.50.13: On the phrase *tváṣṭā devébhir jánibhiḥ*, which, with Re, I consider to be the equivalent of "with the wives of the gods, with the divine wives," see comm. ad II.36.5.

VI.50.15: On the phrase *máma tásya* as a probable play on the PN Mamatǎ, see comm. ad VI.10.2.

     The phrase *vásavo ádhṛṣṭāḥ* returns from 4b, where it refers to the Maruts (unless, with Ge and Re we take *vásavaḥ* there, and here, as referring to a separate group, the Vasus). There it was immediately preceded by *hūtāsaḥ* 'invoked', here by *hutāsaḥ* 'offered to', an understated but clever variation. In this context, the final totalizing vs. of the hymn, the "unassailable good ones" should probably refer to all the gods, in a gender-inclusive pairing with the *gnāḥ* '(divine) ladies' -- an unusual bow to the female side.

VI.51 All Gods
     For the structure of this hymn (or, rather, composite of two hymns), see publ. intro.

VI.51.1: The full realization of the dual dvandva *mitrā-váruṇā-* as two independent dual genitives separated by a pāda-break and several words -- *mitráyoḥ … váruṇayoḥ* -- is a fine demonstration of the reality of this type of cmpd. in the Sprachgefühl.

     I do not understand the pāda-final *ǎ(m̌)*. Generally in this position *ā* follows an abl., reinforcing the meaning "von … her" (see Gr. col. 169), or a loc. But *mitráyoḥ* is of course not an abl., and, though it could grammatically be a loc., by sense it can only be a gen. It seems pleonastic -- perhaps added to allow a Triṣṭubh cadence.

VI.51.2: *vidátha-* is here not 'ceremony of division, rite', but rather 'division' itself, referring to the divisions of the gods. Ge aptly adduces VI.52.15 in the next hymn, where the gods are born in 3 different localities.

     Old strenuously objects to taking *sanutár ā ca* as a conjoined phrase of directional elements (flg. BR), and Re agrees with him. I do not see the problem; *ā* is of course generally a preverb and less commonly an adposition, but in these usages it is clearly directional/locational, and conjoining it with another such element seems well within RVic syntactic bounds, even if the other word is more clearly adverbial. Moreover, neither Old nor Re gives any indication of what to do with *ca* if it's not conjoining the two. I therefore follow Ge (flg. BR) and Klein (DGRV I.63). (The case of Re is a bit complex: he expresses his objections to the BR view in the notes to the Viśvedevāḥ hymns in EVP IV, but in the tr. of those same hymns in EVP V he tr. as a conjoined phrase "au loin et au près." Either he forgot or he changed his mind.)

VI.51.3: The opening of this vs., *stuṣé*, is identical to the beginning of VI.49 and very similar to the beginning of VI.50 (*huvé*), both of which vss. (VI.49.1, VI.50.1) contain the divine list discussed in the next paragraph.

We have already had occasion to note (comm. ad VI.49.1, 50.1) the unexpected trio Varuṇa, Mitra, Agni, in which Agni substitutes for expected Aryaman. Here we have a different third member: Aditi, Mitra, Varuṇa (*áditim mitráṃ váruṇam*), opening rather than closing the pāda. Of course, as their mother, Aditi has a closer connection to Mitra and Varuṇa than Agni does, but in fact she is rarely found in their immediate company: only in the voc. phrase II.27.14 *ádite mítra váruṇotá* also pāda-init. and in a larger list of gods in V.46.3. In our passage the missing Aryaman is added at the beginning of the next pāda (3c), just as he was added in the pāda (c) immediately following the list in VI.50.1b. Note that in VI.50.1 *áditim* precedes the trio in the first pāda of the vs. (VI.50.1a).

In pāda a I take *maháḥ* as an acc. pl., contra the standard tr. (Ge, Re, Scar 291) "herdmen of great truth." Either is of course grammatically and semantically possible, but I was influenced by the undoubted acc. pl. *maháḥ* also referring to the gods in the next vs. (4b) as well as 9d.

The *vaḥ* in pāda a is ambig. With the standard tr. (Ge, Re, Scar 291), I take it as referring to the gods in the 2nd ps. On the other hand, references to the gods have so far been in the 3rd ps. and will remain so in the next vs.; 2nd ps. address only appears in vs. 5. So it would be equally possible to take *vaḥ* as an instance of the common practice of a poet addressing his priestly comrades, "I will praise, for you/on your behalf, the great herdsmen of truth …" Nothing much hangs on the difference, nor is there any way to determine which is correct.

Note that *ádabdha-dhītīn* 'having undeceivable inspired thoughts' at the end of c echoes *áditim* beginning b, despite the differences in lexicon and even segmentation. It also is responsive with *ṛtá-dhītayaḥ* 'having truth as inspired thoughts' in 10d, and the two form part of the ring around the omphalos vss. 6–7. While *ádabdha-* is taken up by *ádabdhān* in 4a.

For *sadhanyàḥ* I now favor the scenario sketched by Scar (291) as an alternative to the analysis as belonging to a root noun cmpd. *sadha-nī̂-*. See comm. ad IV.1.9. As noted there, Scar begins with a *sa-dhána-* 'common wealth' to which a **sadhaní-* 'sharer in common wealth' → 'companion' could be formed. He then suggests that because of a perceived connection with √*nī*, the stem was reinterpreted and reformed as *sadhanī̂-*. Although this requires more machinery than simply taking it as a root noun cmpd. to √*nī* in the first place, the semantics of that supposed cmpd. are somewhat troublesome; moreover the stem *sadhanitvá-* can be more easily derived by this route.

158: I follow Ge (as well as Th Fremdling, Oberlies I.344, etc.) in rendering *suvasaná-* as 'good dwelling', against some potentially good arguments to the contrary. The stem is attested only once elsewhere, IX.97.50 in the phrase *vástrā suvasanāni*, where it clearly refers to good garments (√*vas* 'wear, clothe'), and the base of our cmpd, *vásana-* (a hapax), likewise only means clothing. Citing these words, as well as *vastra-dā́-* 'giving garments' (V.42.8; like our phrase *suvasanásya dātṝ́n*), Re holds firm to "donateurs de bonne vêture" (so also Gr). But *sátpatīn* 'lords of settlements' in the preceding pāda supports a 'dwelling' interpr., and it would be easy to form such a deriv. to the well-attested root √*vas* 'dwell'. (Note that the derivatives that would support the 'clothing' sense are found in that sense only once apiece, so do not seem well established enough to block such a formation.)

Ge construes *diváḥ* with *nṝn* and take *kṣáyataḥ* absolutely: "die mächtigen Herrn des Himmels." As in vs. 2, Re seems to have changed his mind (a phenomenon I know well; witness this comm.) between the comm. fascicle (EVP IV) and the tr. fascicle (EVP V): in the former he comments of *kṣáyataḥ* "emploi absolu," but in the latter tr. "seigneurs résidants du ciel," with *diváḥ* dependent on the participle. He evidently assigns the participle to 'dwell', though the participle of the root pres. to that root is only *kṣiyánt-*, while *kṣáyant-* belongs to *kṣáya-* 'rule over'. (Curiously he correctly interpr. the finite *kṣáyatha* in 7c as "vous régnez.") Ge (etc.) must base their interpr. on the existence of the phrase *divó náraḥ / nṝn*, but though this collocation is attested elsewhere (e.g., V.54.10, VI.2.3, VI.2.11=14.6), it is not a particularly common expression, and √*kṣi* 'rule over' regularly takes a genitive, incl. in 7c *víśvasya hí kṣáyatha* "for you rule over all," a phrase Re in fact cites in his comm.

VI.51.5: This vs. consists primarily of a string of vocatives, plus a couple of 2ⁿᵈ pl. impvs., so in one way it is quite straightforward. However, the accentual behavior of the vs., and particularly the vocc., is peculiar. The first pāda consists only of vocatives: two double names (Father Heaven, Mother Earth) and a single adjective (by word order belonging to the latter, but it is a root noun cmpd and its voc. is indifferent to gender). Each word in the pāda is accented (with voc. accent): *dyaùṣ pítaḥ pṛ́thivi mãtar ádhruk*. The first three words of the next pāda are likewise vocatives: a name plus epithet and a different (pl.) name. Only the first of these is accented: *ágne bhrātar vasavaḥ*. The next word is an impv. *mṛḷátā*, and it is accented after the extrasentential voc. phrase (cf. comm. ad VI.50.11, where this was floated as a possibility to explain an unusually accented verb [the same verb in fact], though rejected). The third pāda also begins with three vocatives, one a two-word phrase, one an individual name, with only the first accented: *víśva ādityā adite*. I am completely puzzled as to why the first pāda differs from the next two. Old is also puzzled: "Behandlung der Vokativakzente befremdet, aber wir haben kein Recht zu rühren."

The content of the vs. is otherwise banal. As Re points out, *víśva ādityāḥ* is a stand-in for *víśve devāḥ*.

VI.51.6: Pāda d must remain in the domain of *hí* in c, as shown by the accent on *babhūvá*, as is recognized by the standard tr.

The repetition of *yūyám* at the beginning of d is, I think, due not only to rhetoric but to the desire to make the ps./no. of *babhūvá* perfectly clear. The 2ⁿᵈ pl. act. pf. is surely the least well attested form of the act. perfect system (save for 1ˢᵗ du.), and it also has a highly under-characterized ending (-*a*), which has the misfortune to be identical to the ending of the best attested form in the pf. system, the 3ʳᵈ sg., as well as the less well attested 1ˢᵗ sg. (For the relative strengths of attestation, a glance at Macdonell's Vedic Grammar §485 will suffice.) In most pf. paradigms it would be distinguished from those forms by ablaut grade (e.g., 1ˢᵗ sg. *cakára*, 3ʳᵈ sg. *cakā́ra*, 2ⁿᵈ pl. *cakrá*), but here, because the pf. of √*bhū* doesn't ablaut, only the accent separates it from 3ʳᵈ (and 1ˢᵗ) sg. *babhū́va*. This may be another reason that it was kept syntactically in the realm of *hí*, to require it to have an accent. It's worth noting that this is the only 2ⁿᵈ pl. pf. to √*bhū* in the RV.

dákṣa- is ordinarily a noun, 'skill', but in the publ. tr. I was persuaded by the standard tr. to render it as an adj. 'skillful' with *vácas-*. This phrase also occurs in VIII.86.1

and, with a different derivative of √*vac*, in X.113.9 *dákṣebhir vacanébhiḥ*. In the latter I tr. as an adj. "with skillful words," but in the former as two independent nouns "of skill and of speech." I am uncertain which is correct. Re is quite stern: "*dákṣa-* est nécessairement adjectif ici et en plusieurs passages …: inutile de chercher à éviter ici l'emploi, avec Gr., emploi qui est le seul subsistant en skt cl." The Classical Skt. usage is suggestive, but I am wary of the absolutist language of "nécessairement" and "inutile": very few things in RVic interpr. are absolutely necessary. I would therefore allow an alt. tr. here: "you have become (the charioteers) of (our) skill and speech." That vs. 9 contains a cmpd. containing the noun, *pūtá-dakṣa-* 'of refined skill', though modifying the gods, might support a 'skill' interpr. here, esp. as the 'charioteer' motif is found there as well.

VI.51.7: On apparently anomalous *mā̆ … bhujema* see comm. ad IV.3.13.
      Re points out the rarity of the cmpd. *viśvádeva-* in the pl. referring to the All Gods (though to his X.125.1 should be added VII.35.11). At least in our passage the full voc. *viśve devāḥ* would produce a bad cadence.

VI.51.8: In this deliberately repetitive vs. (6 occurrences of *námas-*), it is difficult to render the repeated verbs *ā̆ vivase* (a, d) in the same way. As the desid. to √*van*, *vivāsa-*, esp. with *ā̆*, means lit. 'seek to win here', hence 'attract', which is fine in pāda a. But with the object "committed offense" (*kṛtám énaḥ*) the sense is harder to manipulate. I take it as 'win back', hence 'redeem'; Ge 'abbitten' (beg pardon, apologize), with no attempt to connect this tr. to the literal meaning or to the other occurrence of the verb in the passage; Re makes good use of his usual parentheses: "je l'attire (pour le détruire)," which evades the problem.

VI.51.9: This vs. recalls the *námas-* vs. (8), with its two occurrences of *ā̆ vivase*, one of which is construed with instr. *námasā*. Here we have the verb form *ā̆ name*, which imitates *ā̆ vivase* in preverb and med. 1st sg. form, but with the verbal root from which *námas-* is derived, √*nam* 'bow, bend'. It also is construed with an instr. of the *s*-stem, *námobhiḥ*.

VI.51.10: Judging from the repeated *té* and the *u* that follows the 2nd one (strikingly in the middle of a pāda), we should be dealing with two parallel clauses, one nominal, one verbal. The accent on *náyanti* shows that the 2nd clause is in the domain of the *hí* in pāda a. Ge renders as two clauses, but does not seem to keep the 2nd in the *hí* domain; Re ignores the *té u* and tr. as a single clause. There does not appear to be a main clause in the vs., unless we want to construe cd as a nominal main cl. ("they are of good rule …").
      sukṣatrá- reprises the same word in 4c, and as noted ad vs. 3, *ṛtá-dhīti-* matches *ádabdha-dhīti* in 3c. The two are part of the supportive ring around the omphalos vss. 6–7.
      Once again we meet the trio Varuṇa, Mitra, Agni (see comm. on vs. 3, and previous vss. noted there), but Aryaman is nowhere in the vicinity and Aditi only in a rather random list in the next vs. (11).
      Consonant with the focus on truth in this hymn, pāda d is framed by the words *ṛtá-* and *satyá-*, the former as first member of a cmpd, the latter as last member. As was just noted, *ṛtá-dhīti-* is a well-formed bahuvrīhi with a parallel already in the hymn. But *vakma-rāja-satya-* is distinctly peculiar. For one thing, it has three members, which is unusual for

the RV. But more striking is the final member *satya-*, whose relation to the prior (complex) member *vakma-rā̆ja(n)-* is unclear. (Curiously, AiG doesn't touch this cmpd.) Its only possible parallel is the even stranger *ṛtá-jāta-satya-*, with both *ṛtá-* and *satyá-*, in IV.51.7 (see comm. ad loc.). Gr glosses "dem Lenker der Gebete treu oder willfährig." Ge treats as two separate words "'die beredten Könige, die wahrhaften," without commenting on this disjunction (or does he think it's a dvandva?), though he cites Sāy. as interpr. "wahrhaftig gegen die Herren der Rede d.h. die Sänger," which is also reflected in Gr.'s gloss. Old's "in Wahrheit Könige der Rede" and Re's "qui sont vraiment les rois de la parole (sacrale)" are in essential agreement, and the publ. tr. follows them -- though I feel as though we're all missing something.

VI.51.11: The publ. tr. seems to suggest an etymological relationship between "earthly realm" and "Earth," but in fact they are lexically distinct: *kṣā̆ma* and *pṛthivī̂*, though adjacent.

The list of strengtheners in ab is oddly assorted, but up till the last term they are all divinities or (*pṛthivī̂*) capable of being so configured; I therefore don't understand the presence of the "five peoples" (*páñca jánāḥ*), who are humans. Ge's ref. to X.53.4 is no help (at least to me).

Both Ge and Re take the injunc. *vardhan* as modal "may they / let them strengthen." Certainly the impv. *bhávantu* in the 2nd hemistich would support this interpr., but in general modal readings of injunctives are rather rare.

The 2nd hemistich contains 5 cmpds with *su-* as first member, all but the last bahuvrīhis, as Re points out. The odd-man-out is *sugopāḥ* 'good herdmen'. All 5 have accent on the 2nd member.

VI.51.12: As disc. in the publ. intro., this is the final vs. of the first hymn in this composite group and as such summarizes the just-concluded hymn and asks for divine favor, naming the poet, or rather his family.

The grammatical identity and the use of *náṃśi* is uncertain. Gr labels it as an aor. (also Wh Rts), 1st sg. middle, and this interpr. is reflected in Ge's and Re's tr. -- though both add a modal feature ("möchte ich …," "je voudrais …") that would again be somewhat unusual for an injunctive. Lub also groups it with the root aor. and calls it an injunc. but with ? (By contrast Hoffmann won't commit to an analysis [219].) In one sense a finite aor. is the most likely interpr., but if so, we must explain the accent on what appears to be a non-initial main-clause verb. The hemistich would also switch from 1st ps. in this pāda to 3rd ps. in the rest of the vs. (*bhā̆radvājaḥ … yāti …*), and though RVic discourse is certainly capable of that, it's one more anomaly. The publ. tr. follows Old's preference for Ludwig's interpr. of the form as an infinitive. In either case (finite form or infin.) it is, as Old says, "auffallend gebildet." I take it as a loc. inf. with a purpose function, though I realize that this is ad hoc.

In the context of later śrauta ritual, the application of *hotā̆* and *yájamānaḥ* to the same individual would be strange. But the ritual roles so distinct in middle Vedic śrauta texts are by no means clearly parceled out in the RV, and in particular *yájamāna-* does not usually identify a particular ritual role but acts as an attributive participle, as I think it does here.

VI.15.13–15: As noted in the publ. intro., I consider the remaining vss. to belong to a different hymn (or hymns?), appended to the unified, well-structured hymn found in vss. 1–12. Vss. 13–15 are unified by their meter, including an unusual variant of Uṣṇih with the configuration 8 8 / 8 4; see disc. ad vs. 13. Whether vs. 16, in Anuṣṭubh, belongs to this set or was independently appended I don't know, but it certainly has a "final" feel to it.

VI.51.13: This first vs. of the extra material has various lexical ties to the first hymn: *vṛjinám*: 2c *vṛjinā́*; *satpate*: 4a *sátpatīn*; *ripúm*: 7d *ripúḥ*, which might help explain why it (and the following two vss.) were attached here.

  Ge attaches *daviṣṭhám asya satpate* to ab and begins a new cl. with *kṛdhī́*: "Schaffe gute Fahrt." I assume that one of his motivations is the accent on *kṛdhī́*, which appears to be in the middle of a pāda. And he may feel that making "easy passage" (*sugám*) for a criminal would be contrary to expectation. However, he seems to ignore the *asya* -- at least I find nothing in his tr. that corresponds to it. The accentual problem can be easily resolved: the three vss. 13–15 seem to have an 8 8 / 8 4 structure, rather than 8 8 / 12. On this analysis of the meter, *kṛdhī́* starts a new pāda and should be accented. In vs. 14 *vṛ́ko hí ṣáḥ* is a new clause and nicely fits a separate pāda, and in vs. 15 *gopā́ amā́* is also syntactically separate.

  Vs. 15 also supports my interpr. in another way: *kártā naḥ … sugám* "make good passage for us" is syntactically parallel to my interpr. of 13 … *asya … kṛdhī́ sugám* "make good passage for him," with *naḥ* corresponding to *asya*. As for making good passage for a criminal, the point is to get him as far away as fast as possible, and good passage will accomplish this faster than bad.

  (Re's interpr. is overly complex; though he does find space for the *asya*, he does not deal with the accented verb. I won't treat it further here.)

VI.51.14: The unusual position of *hí*, normally a 2nd position element, is due to immediately following *kam*. For whatever reason (and I don't know it), *hí kam* is a phrasal unit, whether it occurs in expected 2nd position (I.98.1, II.28.8, VIII.11.10) or not (VIII.44.24, IX.49.4, X.100.5). II.37.5 may provide a transition between the two, since the *hí kam* sequence is not pāda-initial there, but it is in 2nd position in its clause.

  The standard treatments (Gr, Ge, Re) take *vāvaśúḥ* to √*vaś* 'wish for', but Kü (477–80) has argued persuasively that morphological factors favor instead a connection with √*vāś* 'bellow' -- though he allows for a secondary contamination from the former root for a sense "sehnsüchtig brüllen." I am in complete agreement. The most salient feature of the pressing stones is their noise, and so bellowing for Soma's companionship like the bovines that are the usual subjects of √*vāś* makes perfect sense.

  See comm. ad vs. 13 for the four-syllable pāda consisting of the nominal sentence *vṛ́ko hí ṣáḥ*. As I argued in my 2009 "Function of Animals in the RV" (Paris animal vol., 206–9, esp. 208), the wolf is a cross-category in RVic classification, and this statement is a quasi-legal declaration that a particular human evil-doer is an outlaw -- with parallels in other early Indo-European traditions.

VI.51.15: In the second hemistich *ádhvan* 'on the road' and *amā́* 'at home' are contrastive, as Re points out. The brief tag *gopā́ amā́* must be a separate clause: both Ge and Re supply an imperatival "be," as do I. Again clausal division supports the metrical division suggested ad vs. 13.

VI.51.16: One possible arg. for taking vs. 16 with the three that precede, despite their metrical difference, is that *sᵘvastigā́m* in b is reminiscent of *sugám* in 13d and could form a little ring. But I'm not at all certain this is sufficient.

VI.52 All Gods

For the structure of the hymn, see publ. intro.

VI.52.1: The instr. of ab, in two semantic sets -- Heaven and Earth, sacrifice and ritual labors -- apparently are the entities that the speaker swears by.

The vs., at least its 2ⁿᵈ hemistich, has a slangy feel -- with the unusual phonology of the root √*ubj* 'crush' and the lexeme *ní* √*hā* 'be bent double' (in my rendering), found elsewhere only in a curse in the Anhangslied VII.104.10.

The agent noun *yaṣṭár-* seems like a potential candidate for the role of technical term for 'Sacrificer', which was rejected in favor of *yájamāna-*.

VI.52.1–2: It is unfortunately impossible to capture in Engl. the play between *ánu* √*man* 'concede' (1a) and *áti* √*man* 'disdain' (2a), with the further echo of *áti* in *atiyājá-* (1d).

VI.52.2: *nínitsāt* is an unusual formation: a subjunctive to a desiderative. It may lend immediacy to the action, which is to be taken against a formulation that is *being performed* (note the pres. part. *kriyámāṇam*).

Old, Ge, and Re all take *vṛjināni* as a nominalized adjective ("seine Falschheiten," etc.), modified by or identified with *tápūṃṣi* (e.g., Ge "dem mögen seine Falschheiten zu Feuerflammen werden"), rather than simply as an adjective. It would be possible to tr. it adjectivally ("for him let there be twisting, scorching [flames]"). In the publ. tr. I chose to render *vṛjināni* both ways, as a nominalized adj. ('twisted [ways]') and as an adj. 'twisting' characterizing the flames. In this way the punishment fits the crime. Note that *vṛjiná-* was used twice in the preceding hymn, VI.51.2, 13.

VI.52.3: Ge (and to a lesser extent Re) takes the repeated *kím aṅgá* as "why?" But this seems more insulting to Soma than seems wise if we are urging him to strike our enemies. I take it rather as marking a series of solemn rhetorical question setting out the reasons why Soma should come to our aid.

VI.52.4: Although this vs. begins a new tṛca, it continues the series of pres. participles that bring a vivid immediacy to the poet's bids for help: *kriyámānam* (2b) 'being performed', *nidyámānam* (3c) 'being scorned', and here *jā́yamānāḥ* (4a) 'being born', *pínvamānāḥ* (4b) 'swelling'. The *dhruvā́saḥ* 'steadfast' in c brings all this ongoing action to a halt, and *deváhūtau* breaks the series entirely -- until the next vss.

VI.52.5: Another pres. part. *uccárantam* 'rising'.

Ge and Re interpr. *devān* as a truncated gen. pl., which would be esp. unusual in pāda-initial position (pāda-final being at least arguably more plausible). Old seems to take this interpr. as tantamount to a moral lapse ("… scheint mir Verlassen des geraden Weges"). He takes it as the acc. pl. it appears to be, but construes it with *āgamiṣṭhaḥ* ("der den Göttern am besten mit Hilfe beispringt"). Although this is syntactically possible, it is semantically unlikely: Indra, who by the evidence of the repeated and expanded phrase in 6a is clearly the subject, is most welcome to come to *us*; I doubt if we care whether the gods hope for his arrival or not. My own solution is somewhat dodgy: I take *óhānaḥ* as a pass. part. 'being lauded as' with the venerable formulaic phrase *vásupatir vásūnām* "goods-lord of goods" as the title given by the laud (so far so good), with *devān* a loosely relational acc., almost an acc. of extent: "(lauded) over/across the (other) gods." (Ge's and Re's interpr. of *vásupatir vásūnām* and *óhānaḥ* vary, and I will not detail them here.)

VI.52.6: The part. *pínvamānā* is repeated from 4b, with a small twist of phraseology: Sarasvatī swelling *with* the rivers, rather than the rivers swelling as in 4b.

The syntactic status of the various gods in bcd is unclear. Are they all separate subjects of *āgamiṣṭhaḥ* (so Re)? Or should we supply other verbs? Ge supplies "sei" with cd, but keeps b with a, implicitly making Sarasvatī another subj. of *āgamiṣṭhaḥ*. Or is this just the beginning of an All God list, with no predicates required -- or feeding into the next tṛca inviting the All Gods to come here?

VI.52.7–12: These two tṛcas (7–9, 10–12) are in Gāyatrī, and the first tṛca esp. is an elementary production, with almost no tricks (though see vs. 9). One wonders whether great swaths of RV-period poetry were similarly lackluster and therefore not generally preserved.

VI.52.9: This vs. consists of two 3rd pl. impv. clauses, ab and c. The 2nd is entirely straightforward, and the first is until the end, where we find a hemistich-final rel. prn. *yé*, clearly coreferential with the subj. of the impv. but difficult to construe: *úpa naḥ sūnávo gíraḥ, śṛṇvántu amŕtasya yé*. The only grammatical way to interpr. this is as a tag nominal rel. cl. *amŕtasya yé* "who (are) of the immortal one." But this leaves the main-cl. subj. *sūnávaḥ* underdefined: it is not any set of sons that we invite to hear our hymns, but only the sons of the immortal one. But tag rel. clauses generally give additional, not necessary, information about their referents in the main clause, and so such an interpr. would leave the sentence oddly unbalanced. We cannot take the whole hemistich as a rel. cl. ("which sons of the immortal …"), not only because the rel. prn. would be too deep in its clause, following both subject and VP, but also because impvs. do not occur in subordinate clauses in the RV. I think we're dealing with a poet who knew about tag rel. clauses and wanted to try his hand at one, but didn't know how they work. As Ge points out (n. 9ab), the substance of the cl. is identical to X.13.1 *śṛṇvántu víśve amŕtasya putrāḥ*. Given these considerations, I have not attempted to render the *yé* -- passing in silence over a journeyman's lapse.

VI.52.10: The first hemistich here does assay a little figure: *ṛtā- ṛtú-* across the pāda boundary.

The use of *yújya-* in c is not entirely clear to me. I take it to mean that the offering, the milk (*páyaḥ*), is ritually associated with the calls (*hávana-*) the gods are hearing. Cf. VI.3.8. Ge and Re think that the association is between the substance and the gods.

VI.52.11: This vs. is essentially parallel to vs. 10: various gods are to enjoy both verbal and material offerings, with the verb stem *juṣá-* 'enjoy' held constant. Vs. 10 has an impv. *juṣántām*, but our vs. an injunc. *juṣanta*. The latter may be a substitute for the impv. in a metrical situation that favors a light final syl.

VI.52.13–15: I consider these three vss. as a tṛca. They are thematically unified, by their focus on the gods in general and (esp. vss. 13 and 15) by their classification of the gods into groups based on their location and type. On the supposed Jagatī meter of vs. 14, which would not match its tṛca partners, see ad loc.

VI.52.13: The disjunctive pairing *yé agnijihvā́ utá vā yájatrāḥ* is puzzling if we take the *utá vā* seriously. Klein's tr. (DGRV II.168–69) can stand for the standard tr.: "which ones have Agni as their tongue or are worthy of worship." Klein considers this an example of "opposed but nonantonymous terms" giving a "subcategorization of heavenly ones." But when so rendered there seems to be no distinction between the two groups: the general run of gods who are worthy of the sacrifice also receive those oblations through Agni -- there's no reason for a *vā*. I am therefore inclined to pay attention to the *-tra* instrument suffix on *yájatrāḥ*: 'the instruments or means of sacrifice'. Such an interpr. divides the set into those who require Agni as intermediary and those who directly effect the sacrifice. Exactly who the latter might be, I'm not certain -- perhaps only Soma. If I am correct, *yájatra-* is used differently from *yajñíya-* in the next vs. But see vs. 17 where *yájatra-* does not seem to have the instrument sense.

VI.52.14: This vs. is metrically problematic. The Anukr. (also HvN) identifies it as a Jagatī, but the vs. instead seems mostly to be aiming to be a Triṣṭubh, like the surrounding (and thematically related) vss. 13 and 15. To begin at the end, d is simply a standard Triṣṭubh pāda (though with uncommon break): 11 syllables with a fine cadence. The intermediate pādas b and c have 12 syllables (possibly 13 in c), but a Triṣṭubh cadence, which seems more diagnostic than the syllable count. Old (ad loc. and ad I.53.10) favors an "überzählig" interpr. for both, in other words as Triṣṭubhs with an extra syl.; see his disc. in Prol. 67. Only pāda a is an unproblematic Jagatī, and even here, as Old points out (though he does not favor this analysis), it might be possible to read the final word *yajñíyāḥ* as a disyllable, which would again produce a perfect Triṣṭubh.

VI.52.16: Agni and Parjanya seem an odd couple, and this dual dvandva is found only here. But recall that the two appear together earlier in the hymn, in vs. 6 (with Indra and Sarasvatī), and in fact Parjanya is oddly well represented in this set of All God hymns; cf. the dual dvandva *parjányā-vā́tā* in VI.49.6, 50.12. In our vs. the two are given a division of

labor, conveyed by the "the one … the other" construction of c (*íḷām anyó janáyad gárbham anyáḥ*), but curiously which god is responsible for which begetting is unclear enough to have produced entirely opposite interpretations. In his n. 16c Ge, who does not commit himself in his tr., cites Sāy. at length, who thinks that Parjanya produces the *íḷā-*, while Agni produces the *gárbha-*. Re the exact oppposite: "Que l'un [Agni] engendre l'oblation-liquide, l'autre [Parjanya] le germe." Although I think Re is more likely correct, the analysis is by no means certain. Note, on the one hand, nearby VI.50.12 *parjányā-vātā pipyatām íṣaṃ naḥ* "Let Parjanya and Vāta swell refreshments for us," which supports Sāy.'s interpr. On the other, Parjanya is more regularly associated with *rétas-* 'semen', and one passage in one of the three hymns dedicated to him, V.83.1, is esp. telling: *réto dadhāti óṣadhīṣu gárbham* "He deposits his semen as embryo in the plants," with the *gárbha-* found here. The ambiguity is probably meant.

　　　As Ge points out, the two products are reconciled in the last pāda, where both gods are urged jointly to give us "refreshments accompanied by offspring" (*prajávatīr íṣaḥ*), with *prajā-* standing in for *gárbha-* and *íṣ-* for *íḷā-* from pāda c.

VI.52.17: A typical final vs. summarizing the ritual. For *yajatrāḥ* see comm. ad vs. 13.

VI.53 Pūṣan
　　　Although, as noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is remarkably bloodthirsty, there is also a minor theme focusing on poetry and poetic formulation. The word *dhī́-* 'poetic vision' is found in the first and last vss., shaping a faint ring, as well as in vs. 4. And Pūṣan is called *kaví-* in vs. 5, and his awl is the 'impeller of the *bráhman-*' (*brahma-códanī-*) in vs. 8.

VI.53.2: This is the only possible passage in the RV in which *gṛhápati-* 'houselord' may refer to a human (as also noted by Oberlies, I.355 n. 99); in all other cases its referent is Agni. (See my forthcoming "The Term *gṛhastha* and the (Pre)history of the Householder.") The presence of *nárya-* 'stemming from men' and *vīrá-* 'hero' may support a human reading for *gṛhápati-*; in both cases we seem to be aiming for valuable goods given to us by human patrons, and "a houselord of value" (*vāmáṃ gṛhápatim*) would be a third such instance. However, since both *nṛ́-* and *vīrá-* can also refer to gods in the RV, the human element is by no means assured, and the otherwise exclusive use of *gṛhápati-* for a god in the RV is telling. If the word does refer to a human, this may be another indication of the popular character and lower linguistic register of the Pūṣan hymns, as *gṛhápati-* does refer to humans in the AV.

　　　DL suggests to me that, though the dominant sense of *vāmá-* here must be 'valuable', there might be a pun on *vāmá-* (or *vǎma-*; see EWA s.v.) 'left', immediately following *práyata-dakṣiṇam*. The 2nd member of that bahuvrīhi is of course *dákṣiṇā-* 'priestly gift', but the adj. stem *dákṣiṇa-* means 'right (/south)'. Although *vāmá-/vǎma-* 'left' is not attested until the ŚB, it could well have been current in ordinary speech before that, as its presence in MIA (e.g., Pāli *vāma-*) suggests. Perhaps another sign of the more demotic lexicon of this hymn.

VI.53.3: For some reason Ge always refuses to tr. the standing epithet of Pūṣan, *ā́ghṛṇi-*, though he fearlessly takes on far more challenging lexical items. The word must belong to the inherited root √*ghṛ* 'be hot, burn', etc., found only in nominal forms in Skt.; see EWA s.vv. *ghṛṇá-*, *gharmá-*. Why Pūṣan is glowing, fiery, I don't know; perhaps it would be best to adopt Re's 'ardent'.

 ví mrada is the only verbal form to this root in the RV, and such forms are quite rare in Vedic (*ví mradate* MS, *mradaya-* TS). (For detailed disc. see Gotō 247–48.) The root is otherwise found in the RV only in the cmpd. *ū́rṇa-mradas-* 'soft as wool, lit. having the softness of wool' in the funeral hymn X.18.10. I wonder if *mrad* belongs to the technical terminology of fabric construction and therefore would fit in with Pūṣan's connection to homely, practical activities, as in the words for 'awl' (or whatever *ā́rā-* is) and the like in this hymn. However, the TS, MS passages don't support this speculation.

VI.53.3–4: Note *ví mrada* (3c), *ví mṛ́dhaḥ* (4b).

VI.53.5–6: On *ā́rā-* see EWA s.v. It is difficult to determine exactly what tool it was, but it seems to have had a sharp point, at least later means 'awl', and means 'awl' in cognate languages. In any case it is the sort of utilitarian implement that we would not expect to find in the hands of, say, Indra, but that is appropriate to the more down-to-earth handyman Pūṣan. The word is found in Vedic only in this hymn (vss. 5, 6, 8). Re's 'lance' seems entirely too elevated; Ge's 'Stachel' is a better fit.

VI.53.7–8: These vss. contains the delightful phrase *ā́ rikha kikirā́ kṛṇu*, whose playful sonic effects I endeavored to capture in my anachronistic tr. The word *kikirā́* is of course a hapax (though cf. YV *kikkiṭā́*), and I doubt if a lexical meaning is to be sought for it.

 I do wonder whether the original phrase read **kuru* for **kṛṇu*. The former is, of course, a late form, belonging to the irregular paradigm *karóti*, *kuruté* that will replace the well-behaved 5th cl. *kṛṇóti* after the RV. The impv. *kuru* is found in only two passages in the late RV, but in a colloquial hymn like this it would be at home, and the phonological patterning would be improved: *ā́ rikha kikirā́ *kuru*, with CV syllables containing repeated high vowels and a consonantal *r* in each word, in addition to the *k*'s. This **kuru* would have been replaced redactionally by the *kṛṇu* standard in RVic discourse on the basis of *kṛṇuhi* in 10c. Vs. 10 displays a more formal level of discourse and imitates the final hymn-summary vss. found through the RV, and the standard RVic form of the pres. of √*kṛ* is in order there.

VI.53.10: As just noted, this vs. leaves the rough-and-tumble and provides a solemn and conventional end to the hymn. For a similar sequence of X-*sā́-* cmpds in a hymn-final vs., see, e.g., IX.2.10, whose pāda b is identical to pāda b here, save for the case (nom. vs. acc.). It also, as noted before, ring-compositionally echoes vs. 1 *dhiyé* with *dhíyam*. The *dhī́-* that we launched in vs. 1 will now (we pray) be crowned with goods.

 The first hemistich nicely begins and ends with *utá*, though the two have different functions—the first as interstanzaic conjunction (Klein DGRV I.401) and the other conjoining the acc. obj. nouns in series (ibid. 351–52).

VI.54 Pūṣan

A remarkably unproblematic hymn on the whole.

VI.54.7: The sequence *mā̆kiḥ … mā̆kīm … mā̆kim*, each followed by an injunctive in prohibitive sense, is remarkable, in that all three can be read (and are read by me, seemingly also Ge: "keines … keines … keines …") as expressing the same (negated) subject of the verbs -- but only *-kiḥ* has a nominative "look." It would be possible, with Gr, to take *mā̆kīm* as 'nimmer, nicht', as against *mā̆kis* 'niemand, keiner', but the sing-song parallelism of the passage invites the two forms to be interpr. identically. (A Gr-inspired interpr. should yield "let none disappear; let it never be harmed …, etc.") Re claims that *mā̆kis* is personal ("puisse aucun(e)") while *mā̆kim* is impersonal ("puisse rien" or "… jamais") -- the latter ("jamais") is of course Gr's position, the former ("rien") seems hard to maintain in this passage, where surely the subjects of the verbs are all the same, namely the cow that is our concern in this part of the hymn. I think we must reckon with a morphological extension even greater than that found in the free-standing particles *sīm* and *īm*. Those two stand for all numbers and genders, but always have accusative function. (See my 2002 Fs. Cardona "RVic *sim* and *īm*.") Here, perhaps by way of the adverbial-type readings favored by Gr and Re (see VIII.45.23), *-kīm* has lost all distinctive case function and can be used as a nominative.

VI.54.8: On *írya-* see comm. ad V.58.4.

In c I take *rāyáḥ* as a morphological pun, both gen. sg. with *ī́śānam* and acc. pl. with *īmahe*. See a more complex example in the next hymn VI.55.2, as well as VIII.26.22, 46.6, 53.1 for the identical pāda with identical interpr.

VI.54.10: The first two pādas are marked by alliteration: *pári pūṣā́ parástād, dhástaṃ dadhātu dákṣiṇam*. The sandhi-induced *dh* of *dhástam* (for underlying *hástam*) is esp. nice.

VI.55 Pūṣan

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is structured by an ever-shifting lexical chain. The links are as follows: vs. 1 *rathī́ḥ* -- 2 *rathī́tamam* / 2 *rāyáḥ sákhāyam* -- 3 *rāyáḥ ... sákhā* / 3 *ajā́śva* -- 4 *ajā́śvam* / 4 *svásur ... jāráḥ* -- 5 *svásur jāráḥ.* For the last vs. which lacks a precise repetition, note *bhrā́tā* in 5 phonologically echoed by *bíbhrataḥ* ending 6, although they are of course lexically unrelated. We might also note that the verb in 1b, *sacāvahai* 'let us two accompany each other', is echoed by the 'companion' word *sákhi-* in vss. 2, 3, and 5, and *ajá-* 'goat', found in the cmpd. *ajā́śva-* 'having goats as horses' of vss. 3–4, reappears in 6 without the horses.

VI.55.1: The tonic 1ˢᵗ dual nominative prn. *vā̆m* 'we two' is a hapax -- the only occurrence of this distinct nominative in all of Sanskrit, replaced post-RV by *āvám*. See AiG III.465–66. It opens its clause, but because it follows the vs.-initial impv. *éhi*, it appears to be in 2ⁿᵈ position. Is it an accident that this is where the extremely well-attested enclitic dual 2ⁿᵈ ps. *vām* is ordinarily found?

VI.55.2: As noted ad VI.54.8 above, this vs. contains a more complex variant of *îśānaṃ rāyá īmahe* in VI.54.8c. There I interpr. *rāyáḥ* as both a gen. sg. with *îśānam* and an acc. pl. with *īmahe*. In our vs. here, *îśānam* is found in pāda b with an undoubted gen. phrase *rắdhaso maháḥ*, while in pāda c *rāyó sákhāyam īmahe* we again find a *rāyáḥ* that is both gen. sg. (with *sákhāyam*) and acc. pl. (again with *īmahe*). This complex seems like a partial "repair" of 54.8, since it makes clear that *îśānam* takes the gen., which in turn suggests that *rāyáḥ* in 54.8 may have that reading too.

VI.55.3: The āmreḍita *dhîvato-dhîvataḥ* 'of every visionary' recalls the focus on *dhî-* in the preceding hymn (VI.54.1, 4, 10).

VI.55.4–5: As noted in the publ. intro., these allusions to incest seem remarkably matter-of-fact. The vss. seem to focus more on the kinship relations — sister, mother, brother, comrade — than any potential violation of them.

VI.55.5: Ge interpr. *abravam* to mean "I have spoken *of*" ("(Von Pūṣan) … habe ich gesprochen"), but the fact that we immediately urge him to hear us suggests that we have spoken *to* him. In the next hymn VI.56.4 … *tvā* … *brávāma* also clearly means "we speak/say to you."

VI.55.6: This vs. presents several problems, both located in pāda b: the hapax *niśṛmbhắḥ* and the highly unusual position of the accented 3rd ps. pl. prn. *té*.

To tackle the first issue first, I am generally persuaded by Berger's 1966 explan. of the Skt. *śrambh* forms as hypersanskritizations of MIA *vissaddha*, etc., in his view itself a cross of Skt. *viśvasta-* and *śraddhā*. See EWA s.v. ŚRAMBH and esp. KEWA s.v. *śrámbhate*. My 'trusty' reflects this possible connection with *śraddhā-* 'trust'.

The position of *té* is highly unusual; this pronominal stem overwhelmingly takes init. (or modified init.) position in its clause. When it does not, it is usually adjacent to the verb or has some other obvious reason for its placement. Here it seems dropped in randomly. I therefore propose to read **tejana-śríyam*, with *téjana-* 'sharp point' found once elsewhere in the RV and also thereafter. The only alteration of the Saṃhitā text this requires is dropping the accent on *té*. Here *téjana-* would refer to the goad or awl that Pūṣan wields (see, e.g. VI.53.5–6, 9). In the publ. tr. I made use of Narten's understanding of *-śrî-* in such cmpds as meaning "vollkommendmachen": see her KlSch. 352 n. 19 for the transmitted reading of this cmpd *jana-śrî-* rendered as 'die Menschen … vollkommenmachend' -- though I took **tejana-* as instr.: 'who brings (all) to readiness *with his sharp (goad)'. But I now prefer a different value for *-śrî-* 'splendid with his sharp (goad)' vel sim., more in keeping with my interpr. of other *-śrî-* cmpds like *ghṛta-śrî-* 'splendid with ghee'. On the multiple semantic possibilities of *-śrî-* cmpds see Scar (544–54); on this cmpd in particular, Scar (551): my interpr. is basically his choice B (though of course with *jana-* rather than *tejana-* as 1st member).

VI.56 Pūṣan

VI.56.1: As noted in the publ. tr., there is difference of opinion about the purport of pāda c *ná téna devá ādíśe*. Ge thinks it's a positive expression (n. 1c): Pūṣan likes porridge so much that he'll come without being asked twice. Re thinks it's more ambiguous: for him the idiom *ā √diś* means 'target' (viser), incl. by evil speech or the like, hence 'menace' -- here, targeting Puṣan with the epithet means that he doesn't have to be targeted "réellement." (Klein's [DGRV I.420] I just don't understand: "by that one is the heavenly one not to be so designated." Does he think that in using that nickname the human is being too familiar with the god?) I find Re's interpr. simply puzzling, but, though Ge's is more persuasive, I think the point is rather that the epithet is a unique designation that picks out Pūṣan once and for all. The usage of *ā √diś* in nearby VI.48.14 is similar; see disc. there. See also VI.57.2 below.

VI.56.2–3: There is general consensus (Ge, Re, Klein loc. cit.) that Indra is the subject of both of these vss., with Pūṣan appearing only as the instr. companion in 2b. By contrast, I consider Pūṣan the "best charioteer" (*rathītamaḥ* in 2a and 3c), because in the immediately preceding hymn *rathī-* (VI.55.1c), *rathītama-* (VI.55.2a) are unequivocally used of Pūṣan. My interpr. requires that the subject change from 2a to 2bc, where Indra is indeed the subject, but see the *anyáḥ … anyáḥ* construction in the next hymn (VI.57.2, cf. 3) where the two gods each appear contrastively in the nominative. This interpr. also has the advantage that Pūṣan doesn't disappear in the middle of his own hymn.

VI.56.2: Pāda c is essentially identical to VI.57.3 in the next hymn, but there Indra's two fallow bay horses are Indra's companions when he smashes obstacles.

VI.56.3: As noted in the publ. intro., the content of this vs. is quite baffling, though the syntax and, for the most part, the lexicon are not. Ge (n. 3) pronounces it a "dunkler Sagenzug," and I can only agree. I have argued that it is connected with the even more baffling VI.48.17 (see comm. there) and that these two passages associate Pūṣan with the "tearing off the Sun's wheel" myth that remains tantalizingly out of our reach. But this must remain speculation.

VI.56.4: Since Pūṣan is the god who sends the cows home and watches over paths and journeys in general, it is entirely appropriate that he should "make [various objects] reach their goal" (*sādhaya*), including our thought. Cf. in the first Pūṣan hymn of this cycle, VI.53.4 *sādhantām … no dhíyaḥ* "Let our poetic visions reach their goal."

VI.56.6: The publ. tr. implies that both 'well-being' (acc. *svastím*) and 'wholeness' (dat. *sarvátātaye*) are the complements of *īmahe* 'we beg', and in fact I think that is the intent of the passage, however loose the syntax. But it might be possible to construe the dat. with 'well-being': "we beg you for well-being to completeness," i.e., for well-being in its entirety.

VI.57 Pūṣan and Indra

VI.57.2: Note the use of 'porridge' as an identifying attribute of Pūṣan; this supports my contention above (ad VI.56.1) that 'porridge-eater' is a descriptor that uniquely identifies Pūṣan.

VI.57.3: See VI.56.2 above.

VI.57.4: The root noun *rít-* to √*ri* 'flow' is a hapax.

VI.57.5: Though apparently straightforward, this vs. is rather oddly constructed, esp. pāda b. The conjoined NP *pūṣṇáh … índrasya ca* "of Pūṣan and Indra" is separated by some distance, though perfectly comprehensible. It is the material that separates it, pāda b *vṛkṣásya prá vayấm iva*, that seems awkward. Particularly odd is the mid-pāda position of *prá*, which is far from its verb (if it has a verb; see below) and breaks up a simile with which is seems unconnected: *vṛkṣásya … vayấm iva* "like the branch of a tree." In the simile itself *iva* is wrongly placed (expect **vṛkṣasya-iva vayấm*). It is also doubtful that *prá* is in tmesis from the verb *(ấ) rabhāmahe*, since *prá* never otherwise occurs with √*rabh*, which is very common with *ấ*. I have no explanation for either the position or the function of *prá*. As for the wrong placement of *iva*, putting it after the 2nd term of the simile is not altogther rare and is therefore less puzzling.

All of this may have something to do with the poet's attempt to set up the play *vayám* (a), *vayấm* (b), though that play would have been more effective if *vayấm* were pāda-final, not followed by *iva*.

VI.58 Pūṣan
As noted in the publ. intro., the style and in part the register of this, the only trimeter hymn in the Pūṣan cycle, is more elevated than the rest. Still, characteristic lexical items -- *ajấśva-* 'having goats for horses', *áṣṭra-* 'goad -- are found.

VI.58.1: It is quite unclear what this vs. is conveying, and my interpr. differs radically from the standard. Flg. Sāy., both Ge and Re supply *rūpám* as the referent for the *anyád … anyád* construction and further assume that these are two forms of Pūṣan, namely, in Ge's words (n. 1ab), "die solare und die gewöhnliche Form des Pūṣan." I find this unlikely for two reasons: 1) I know of no evidence for two forms of Pūṣan, and none is supplied by those who interpr. it thus; 2) there is a perfectly good neut. referent available for the *anyád … anyád* construction, namely the two day-halves (*áhanī*) in b, whose descriptor *víṣurūpe* 'of dissimilar form' seems meant to specify the disjunctive choices given in pāda a. (For a similar disjunctive description of the day-halves, with *anyá- … anyá-*, see nearby VI.49.3.) Moreover, those who take pāda a as referring to Pūṣan's two forms are forced to take *víṣurūpe áhanī* in the simile, as a not very convincing acc. of extent of time (Ge: "du bist wie der Himmel während der verschiedenen Tageshälften") or the like (Re's rendering ["tu es commes le ciel aux deux portions-du-jour"] leaves the syntactic status of the dual expression quite vague). Further, this interpr. pushes the simile-marking *iva* almost to the end of a pāda supposedly consisting entirely of a simile. Although, as just noted (ad

VI.57.5), simile markers are sometimes positioned later than expected, this would be quite late indeed.

So by my interpr. the two oppositional day-halves belong, in some sense, to Pūṣan. Why I'm not sure, nor do I know why he is "like heaven." In conjunction with his mission to the sun in vs. 3 and the ships he uses to travel there, I might speculate that this has to do with Pūṣan's role as psychopomp for the dead, described in the funeral hymn X.17.3–6, esp. vs. 6 *prápathe pathā́m ajaniṣṭa pūṣā́, prápathe diváḥ prápathe pṛthivyā́ḥ / ubhé abhí priyátame sadhásthe, ā́ ca párā ca carati prajānán* "On the forward path of paths was Pūṣan born, on the forward path of heaven, on the forward path of earth. / He wanders back and forth to both the dearest seats, foreknowing." Perhaps his wanderings back and forth to heaven approximate the regular alternation of day and night, and that pair is therefore "his" in some sense. (Such an interpr. gets us close to his two "forms," an interpr. I have just rejected -- I still think that is wrong, however.) As for why he is like heaven, this must rest on the *hí* clause of pāda c, his giving aid to all *māyā́*. What does this mean? Is his mission to take the dead from earth to heaven conceptualized as a *transformation* of the dead, which might be achieved by *māyā́*? A last, smaller but nonetheless nagging, question is why, with day characterized as 'gleaming' (*śukrám*), is night said to be 'belonging to the sacrifice, worthy of the sacrifice' (*yajatám*)? Most Vedic sacrifices take place during the day, save for the Atirātra. Perhaps rites for the dead were associated more with night. All of this speculation is tissue-thin, and I do not put much store by it. However, at least it confronts questions that the other interpr. have not raised.

VI.58.2: Most of the contents of this vs. conform to the characteristics of Pūṣan elsewhere in this cycle, even *dhiyaṃjinvá-* 'quickening poetic vision' (see esp. VI.53), but "fitted into all creation" (*bhúvane víśve arpitaḥ*) and "surveying the creatures" (*saṃcákṣāṇo bhúvanā*) attribute to him a more cosmic role than usual. His speeding (*īyate*) may be a reference to his travels between earth and heaven referred to above, ad vs. 1.

víśve is one of two loc. sg. to this stem with the noun ending *-e* (the other being IV.16.9), but the pronomina *víśvasmin* is also only found twice, both times in X.

VI.58.3: Pūṣan's ships (*nā́vaḥ*) are, to my knowledge, not encountered elsewhere. But, as noted above vs. 1, I would tentatively connect them and the mission of the Sun (*dūtyā̀m sū́ryasya*) with his role as psychopomp of the dead. One question is whether there are two sets of ships -- those in the sea and those in the midspace -- or one, with the midspace being configured here as the sea (Ge's Luftmeer). I subscribe to the latter view.

VI.58.4: Pūṣan's "good lineage (*subándhuḥ*) from Heaven and from Earth" directly recalls X.71.6 cited above ad vs. 1 *prápathe pathā́m ajaniṣṭa pūṣā́, prápathe diváḥ prápathe pṛthivyā́ḥ* "On the forward path of paths was Pūṣan born, on the forward path of heaven, on the forward path of earth."

On the Sūryā story, see, inter alia, my 2001 "The Rigvedic svayaṃvara? Formulaic evidence" (Fs. Asko Parpola) and 2003 "Vedic vrā̀: Evidence for the svayaṃvara in the Rig Veda?" (Fs. H.-P. Schmidt).

VI.59 Indra and Agni

    On the structure of this hymn and the relationship between the two gods, see publ. intro.

VI.59.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the clichéd intro. "I shall proclaim (*prá √vac*) the manly deeds …" associated esp. with Indra hymns (esp. I.32) is here directed to both gods. The "real" subjunctive *vocā* is found only here in the RV, in contrast to the more common injunctive / functional subjunctive *vocam*.

    The enclitic *vām* is unusually stationed pāda-final, but in fact it occupies 2nd position in its small clause, the loc. absol. *sutéṣu vām* "on (the soma-drinks) having been pressed for you two." Ge takes *vām* with following *vīryā̀* ("euren Heldentaten"), but the pāda break that separates them makes that less likely. Re ignores the *vām* in his tr. and attaches the loc. absol. to the rel. cl., which is syntactically unlikely. Pāda-final *vām* is in fact a tic of this hymn; see 2a, 4a, and 5a besides our 1a. Perhaps it echoes the 2nd syllable of *yuvám* 'you two', found at pāda end in 1d, 2c.

    The contents of the 2nd hemistich is quite dramatic. The standard view going back to Sāy. (see Ge's n. 1c) is that the slain Fathers are the Asuras and that this event is also reflected in the enigmatic X.124. However, see my 2016 treatment of X.124, "The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas" (Ged. Staal), which rejects the view that that hymn concerns the Deva/Asura conflict. Here in our passage, certainly the easiest interpretation is that the rivals of the gods are the Asuras, but keep in mind that the Deva/Asura conflict so prominent in the Brāhmaṇas and later does not really surface until very late RV. Moreover, even in the old interpr. of X.124 neither Indra nor Agni appears to have been an Asura. I do not know what to make of our passage, but I doubt that the old interpr. holds.

VI.59.2: The pāda-final *vām* here is also in syntactic 2nd position (as it is in 1a), since *báḷ itthā́* is a extra-clausal exclamation, and the clause proper begins with *mahimā́*.

    For *mahimán-* with √*pan*, see nearby VI.75.6, as well as VIII.101.11, X.75.9, etc.

    I am puzzled by the pāda-final *ā̆*. Gr (col. 171) classifies it as emphatic after numbers or grades, to show that the number or grade has been reached, but the phrases he lists there are quite heterogenous.

VI.59.3: On pleonastic *sácā* see comm. ad IV.31.5. Ordinarily such a *sácā* marks a locative abs., but in this instance *suté* is to be construed with *okivā́ṃsā*. The pāda-final phrase *suté sacāṁ̇* may be there to provide a rhyme-form variant to *sutéṣu vām#* (1a, 4a), which really *are* loc. abs.

VI.59.4: In the 2nd hemistich the form *bhasáthaḥ* is problematic and its identity disputed. With -*thaḥ* it looks like a 2nd du. act. verb, as is to be expected in a hymn dedicated to dual divinities, esp. directly after a voc. du. *devā*. However, this should be a main-cl. verb, and it therefore should not be accented. And even if it should be accented, it has the wrong accent: we have two other forms to an apparent them. stem, both with root accent: 3rd sg. *bhásat* (subjunctive to root aor., acdg. to Gotō 82) VI.3.4 and identical (by most lights) VI.14.1 (I

consider that form a nom. sg. part. *bhásan*). In response to these problems, Ge (inter alia, going back to Aufrecht [see Old] and cautiously endorsed in EWA s.v. BHAS) interpr. it as a noun *bhasátha-* 'the noise of the mouth when eating' (Ge, das Geräusch des Mundes bes. beim Essen). But although this solves the accent problems, it creates greater difficulty elsewhere: not only would that stem be a hapax, but Ge's attempt to fit it into the rest of the clause produces something close to nonsense, whereas a du. verb works well in the clausal syntax. Old and Re wisely opt for the verb (maybe also Gotō 82), the latter without remarking on the accentual problem and the former without suggesting a solution. I also accept it as a verb 'snap at' and also lack a solution to the accent. It cannot be attributed to *caná*, which doesn't induce verbal accent. Its complement is *vádataḥ*, which I take as gen. sg., the correlative of *yáḥ* in the rel. cl. of ab -- with gen. as an alternative to acc. in verbs of consumption (biting counts). As Old points out, it could also be acc. pl., but that would lose the connection with the rel. cl. (Re supplies an acc. obj. on which the gen. depends: "vous ne mordez nullement (les richesses de cet homme) qui dit …," which seems unnec. and unmotivated.)

VI.59.5: As noted in the publ. intro., here the poet dissociates the two gods and in the 2ⁿᵈ hemistich focuses only on Agni. I think the dissociation begins in the 1ˢᵗ hemistich, with … *asyá vām … ciketati* (in my tr.) "…shall perceive *this one* of you two," with *asyá* referring to one of the gods only. Ge and Re by contrast interpr. *asyá* as referring to an unidentified thing (a wonder or the like) belonging to both.

On cd as referring to Agni and his flames, see the very similar phrase in an Agni hymn X.79.7 *víṣūco áśvān yuyuje*. Gonda (Ved. Lit. 133) may be right that this refers to Agni using the same vehicle to carry the oblations to heaven and to bring the gods to the sacrifice. Re interpr. the hemistich as referring to both Agni and Indra, at the cost of a lot of machinery liberally sprinkled with parens.

víṣūcaḥ would be better rendered as 'facing in opposite/different directions'.

VI.59.6: The fem. footless (a*padvátī*) and footless (*padvátībhyaḥ*) are most likely Dawn and her cows, either the rays of light that are the Dawn cows or the real cows that go to pasture at dawn. Cf., with Ge, I.152.3. She appears here presumably to mark the dawn worship where the ritual fire is kindled and Indra appears.

Both Ge and Re divide the 2ⁿᵈ hemistich between Agni (c) and Sūrya (d). I am in full agreement that c belongs to Agni, describing the spread of his flames and crackling of the new fire. But I do not follow their assignment of d to Sūrya. Since the hymn is dedicated to Indra and Agni, we would expect the paired god to be Indra, not Sūrya, who has no place in the hymn. And it easily applies to Indra, as long as we interpr. *padā* as an instr. sg. of 'foot'. Cf. with the same phrase, incl. the same verb, I.51.6 … *arbudáṃ ní kramīḥ padā* "With your foot you [=Indra] trampled down Arbuda" and, with a diff. root but the same preverb, also of Indra, VIII.64.2 *padā paṇīm̐r arādháso, ní bādhasva* "With your foot stamp down the ungenerous niggards." Ge and Re take *padā* as neut. pl. to *padá-* 'foot-step', construed with *triṃśát* as a measure of the distance that Sūrya has crossed. I don't know why they feel the need to introduce Sūrya here -- I suppose because of Uṣas in ab.

With Ge I take *cárat* as a finite verb, an injunctive, accented because it's implicitly

contrastive with the next clause.

VI.59.8: With Ge (cf. also Oberlies, RdV I.457) I supply 'him' as obj. of *yuyutám* in d, referring to the *ari-* of b. Re supplies a pl. obj., referring to the *dvéṣāṃsi* of b. This is not impossible, but it makes more sense to deprive the stranger of sunlight than his hatreds.

VI.60 Indra and Agni

VI.60.1: The vocab. of this vs. shows a slight tendency towards morphological elaboration: in addition to the straightforward *sáhastamā sáhasā*, there is *sáhurī* to the same root but with the rare suffix *-uri*; the deriv. *vasavyà-* for 'goods', rather than standard *vásu* (as in the preceding hymn VI.59.9). This latter word returns at the end of the hymn.

VI.60.2: Assuming that *uṣásaḥ … ūḷhā́ḥ* is a single NP, the question is what happened to the dawns. Ge, fld. by Re, thinks that the dawns were taken away, that is, abducted (entführten, enlevées). If, as Ge suggests (n. 2), this concerns the Vala myth, the dawns qua cows can be conceptualized as taken / stolen by the Paṇis. (Oberlies [RdV I.180] goes further, seeing this as part of a myth about bridestealing, ultimately involving the Aśvins, though he admits [n. 150] that our vs. does not tell us who abducted the Dawn(s) or where she was taken.) HPS (B+I 180 n. 33,) indignantly rejects the abduction interpr. and suggests rather that, on the basis of VI.64.3, 5, the dawns are drawn (*ūḷhā́ḥ*) by bulls. Although this is possible, and the cited passage is quite nearby, it doesn't make a lot of sense for Indra and Agni to "do battle" for the dawns if the dawns are moving on their own steam, whereas if they were abducted, they need help.

 In d Agni must be the immediate subj. of the clause, given the adjacency of the voc. and the 2nd sg. verb (*agne yuvase*) -- but, as Re points out, *niyútvān* is more an epithet of Indra than of Agni -- and, as he doesn't point out, even more an epithet of Vāyu in conjunction with Indra. I therefore wonder if this has not been adapted from an Indra-Vāyu context, with a different set of dual divinities. The d pāda is also very close to an Indra passage fairly nearby: VI.47.14 *apó gā́ vajrin yuvase sám índūn*, with Indra as the subj. of *yuvase*: "You join together the waters, the cows, and the drops, you possessor of the mace." The substitution of Agni and the attribution to him of Indra's qualities and actions is in conformity with the tendency noted in the publ. intro. of favoring the Indraic in this supposedly shared hymn.

VI.60.4: I do not have a view on how (or whether) to fix the meter of pāda a; see Old.
 It is thinkable, but by no means necessary, that instead of reading quadrisyllabic *índrā-agnī* (as in vss. 5, 7, 14), we could read trisyllabic *índrāgnī* (as in 8, 9, 15) with a haplologized enclitic *naḥ*: *índrāgnī ná *no mardhataḥ*.

VI.60.4–5: Note the phonological (and partly etymological) figure *mardh(ataḥ)* (4c), *mŕ̥dh(aḥ)* (5a), *mr̥ḷ(ātaḥ)* (5c).

VI.60.6: Note the curious position of *ápa* in tmesis, embedded in the obj. NP: *ható víśvā ápa*

dvíṣaḥ.

VI.60.8: I follow Ge in construing *dāśúṣe* with *sánti* ("which are for the pious") rather than with *puruspṛ́haḥ* (Re "pour l'adorateur les très enviés") because *puruspṛ́h-* doesn't seem to appear with a dat. elsewhere. See the almost identical IV.47.4.

VI.60.8–9: 8c and 9a differ minimally from each other, and it is difficult to see an aspectual (or other) distinction between root aor. impv. *ā́ gatam* and pres. impv. *ā́ gachatam* -- though of course there may be a nuance we cannot catch. Note also 14b *úpa gachatam* and 15c *ā́ gatam*.

VI.60.11: The syntactic affiliation of the final pāda of this vs., consisting of a dat. *dyumnā́ya* and an acc. phrase *sutárā apáḥ*, is unclear. Old suggests taking the acc. as a second obj. of *āvívāsati*, or rather suggests supplying the same verb as main clause verb "(he also wins) waters …" But since the structure of ab, in which the mortal seeks Indra's favor, invites a demonstration of that favor in the main cl., I therefore borrow *kṛṇoti* (deaccented) from 10c, with Indra as subj. This is also Re's solution and apparently Ge's. For √*kṛ* in similar expressions, see VII.97.8 *kárad bráhmaṇe sutárā sugādhā́* "He [=Bṛhaspati/Indra] will make good fords, easy to cross, for the sacred formulation" and IV.19.6 *sutaraṇā́m akṛṇor indra síndhūn* "You made the rivers easy to cross, Indra."

VI.60.12: On the double sense of *pipṛtam* see Ge and Re.

VI.60.13–15: On the connection of these vss. to the hymn, see publ. intro. For the ring composition between the 1st tṛca and this one, note the verbal response *vasavyà-* (1, 14), *rā́dhas-* (3, 13), *vājayántā* (1) and *vā́jasya sātáye* (14).

VI.60.13: On the insistent *ubhā́* see publ. intro.
    I have taken *āhuvádhyai* (and *mādayádhyai*) as predicated infinitives with the subj. *ubhā́*, as does Re. However, *vām* in pāda a makes some difficulties for this interpr., and Ge takes that pāda (but not b) as having an implicit 1st ps. subj.: "euch beide … will ich herrufen" (a) versus "beiden sollen sich … erfreuen" for *mādayádhyai* (b). I think the two clauses should be parallel and therefore take *vām* as a dependent gen. on *ubhā́* ("both of you two"), although it must be admitted that *ubhá-* generally agrees with its referent in case.

VI.61 Sarasvatī
    On the structure of this hymn and its similarity to the immediately preceding one, see publ. intro.

VI.61.1–3: The hymn begins with the near-deictic nom. sg. *iyám*, establishing the feminine subject immediately and emphatically ("this she here"). Since the just-given tr. is at best graceless and, more to the point, not English, I have opted to focus on the gender rather than the deixis. The next vs. also begins with *iyám* and the final vs. of the tṛca with the voc. *sárasvati*.

VI.61.1: Although, as just noted, the hymn establishes the feminine referent from the very beginning, she is also credited, from the beginning, with powers and deeds that seem distinctly unfeminine, esp. pāda c.

Sarasvatī's gift to the pious Vadhryaśva is universally, and I think correctly, interpr. as a son named Divodāsa, and this gift is further interpr. as reflecting the requital of the "debt to the ancestors" found in the doctrine, attested somewhat later (1ˢᵗ clearly articulated in TS), of the three debts that a Brahmin owes on his birth (to gods, ancestors, and ṛṣis). The requital of this debt is, in the standard view, expressed by the root-noun cmpd *ṛṇacyút-* in our passage. I think this is more or less correct, but not in a straightforward way. Both Ge and Re twist the sense of √*cyu* to get it to express the requital of the debt directly: "der der Schuld (an die Manen) tilgte [paid off]" (sim. Kü 153); "qui ébranle la dette (aux mânes)." But √*cyu* means 'set in motion, agitate, shake', and the best we could do to get the idiom we want is to push its meaning to 'shake off', hence 'get rid of', the debt. But 'shake off' is not a sense of √*cyu* at least in my experience. An unmanipulated sense of the cmpd should be 'shake/agitate the *ṛṇa*', and that is how I interpr. it -- 'shake the debtor' -- with a masc. *ṛṇá-* 'debtor'; the only other non-neut. form of this stem is also in VI (VI.12.5), where it likewise means 'debtor', not 'debt'. In other words I assume that Divodāsa inflicts rough punishment on a debtor; this helps explain why he is characterized as *rabhasá-* 'violent, wild', which does not make much sense if he's just a baby who serves as his father's payment to the ancestors.

However, I also think the sense seen by Ge and Re -- Divodāsa as requital for the debt his father owes to the ancestors -- is also indirectly signaled here. The standard lexeme for this technical term is *ṛṇám* √*ci*; a root-noun cmpd formed to this lexeme would be *ṛṇa-cí-t-*, which in fact is attested once, at II.23.17. Our cmpd *ṛṇa-cyú-t-* is phonologically similar to it, and an acc. sg. *ṛṇacítam would produce a terrible cadence (4 lights), whereas *ṛṇacyútam* is well adapted to a Jagatī cadence (though the immediately preceding syllable should be heavy, not light: (rabha)**sám** *ṛṇacyútam*. What I am suggesting is that *ṛṇacyútam* is the correct reading and it means what it looks like it should mean, without the manipulation of Ge and Re. But that it also phonologically evokes *ṛṇa-cítam, which gives a second, resonant meaning to the passage. This suggestion is similar to, but ultimately quite distinct from, Gotō's (133 n. 166) that *ṛṇa-cyút-* is a transitive active version of *ṛṇa-cít-*, generated from a Zwangslage (predicament, dilemma) in order to express the sense 'entgegennehmen lassen' barred from the other cmpd, which in his view means 'die Busse entgegennehmen'. Scar also discusses *ṛṇa-cyút-* at some length (126–27), offering several possibilities, but not very usefully.

As for the notion of a man's inborn debts in the RV, I think it is alluded to in our text, but quite rarely. The clearest ex. is in the late hymn X.135 (see my "The Earliest Evidence for the Inborn Debts of a Brahmin: A New Interpretation of Ṛgveda X.135." *Journal asiatique* 302.2 [2014]: 245–57), but there is another more glancing reference to it in Maṇḍala VI in VI.20.11, also discussed in the art. cit. In that article I argue that the original system, as seen in the RV, involves only *two* debts: a son for the ancestors and sacrifice for the gods; Brahmacarya for the ṛṣis is a later addition after the institution of studentship had developed.

On the root affiliation of *cakhā́da* see EWA s.v. KHED and Kü (152–53), with lit. The pf., which appears only here in the RV, takes a double acc. On this pāda see Old. and the parallel I.93.4, with √*muṣ* 'steal': *yád ámuṣṇītam avasám paṇíṃ gā́ḥ*.

VI.61.2: Once again, the attributes and actions ascribed to Sarasvatī are decidedly unfeminine, starting with the almost comically off-kilter comparison of her to a root-grubbing boar. The identification of the *bisakhā́-* as a boar is owing to Hoffmann (MSS 8: 5 = Aufs. 387). The point of comparison between the river and the boar must be their noise: *śúṣmebhiḥ* 'with her snortings', though the root-grubbing is presumably part of it, as the river in spate noisily pulls off pieces of the banks.

   Note *ávase* in c, which echoes *avasám* in 1c and is in turn echoed by *á (vi)vās(ema)* in d.

VI.61.3: The phonologically marked (plain *b*) name *bŕ̥saya-* is found elsewhere only in I.93.4, where his offspring (there called *śéṣaḥ* 'remainder') are destroyed as they are here. That is also the vs. that contains the parallel passage cited above ad vs. 1. Although I.93 is a hymn to Agni and Soma and there are no clear connections between the hymns otherwise, at the very least we can probably assume that Br̥sa was a *paṇí-*. I do not understand why *víśva-* modifies this PN: "every Br̥saya" meaning Br̥saya and his ilk? his kin? Or does this imply that the word is not a PN, but a meaningful descriptor of a foe?

   Acdg. to Klein (DGRV I.434–35), the 2nd hemistich begins with an ex. of inverse *utá*, conjoining the clauses of c and d though positioned at the beginning of c. Although this is probably the default explan., I am drawn to Re's more content-rich suggestion that *utá* sets up the contrast between the very different actions of c and d -- though under that analysis we might expect a contrastively accented verb in c (**ávindaḥ*), and, moreover, he gives no parallel passages in which *utá* has such a function.

   The hapless 'them' (*ebhyaḥ*) in d must be the 'god-scorners' (*deva-níd-*) of a, as is the general consensus.

VI.61.4–6: This tr̥ca is almost empty of content, in part because so much of each Gāyatrī — not a capacious meter in the first place — is occupied by repeated material: the last 6 of the 8 syllables of the 1st pāda of each vs. contain the nom. (4) or voc. (5, 6) of the NP *devî sárasvatī*, and the b pādas of 4 and 6 contain responsive material: *vā́jebhiḥ vājínīvatī* (4) and x x *vā́jeṣu vājini*. Otherwise, as a helper (*avitrî*) she is twice asked to help (4c *avatu*, 6b *ávā*). In the publ. tr. these two impvs. are rendered in two different ways: "Let … help" and "aid" respectively. I would now change the 2nd to "help" as well to mark their essential identity (save for ps.). [Note that the HvN restoration of *avitry àvatu* in 4c is wrong: correct their *avitrí* to *avitrî*.]

VI.61.5–6: This, the middle vs. of the tr̥ca, consists only of a rel. cl., which I consider preposed to vs. 6, though without a resumptive pronoun correlative with *yáḥ*. I supply one ('him') as obj. of *ávā* in 6b. Both Ge and Re instead supply 'us' as the obj. of that verb, leaving the rel. cl. in 5 without any syntactic tether. The middle vs. of the next tr̥ca (8) also consists just of a rel. cl.

VI.61.7–9: Unlike the preceding tṛca, this one dispenses with repetition and therefore has more room for meat, comparatively speaking.

VI.61.7: The vs.-initial *utá* seems to introduce the tṛca, as does the identically placed *utá* in vs. 10.

VI.61.8: Like vs. 5, this middle vs. of the tṛca contains only a rel. cl., which I consider to hang off vs. 7, though it could also attach to the flg. vs. 9. Both 7 and 9 have an overt possible correlative for *yásyāḥ* in 8a: 7a *syā̀ … sárasvatī*, 9a *sā́*.

VI.61.9: The various tr. (Ge, Re, Klein [DGRV I.402]) supply a verb in pāda a, reserving *átan* (c) for bc. I do not see why. Both Ge (n. 9a) and Re do allow for the possibility that *átan* has domain over the whole vs., but both identify that possible constr. as a zeugma. Again, I don't see why -- while it is true that hatreds and rivers are different kinds of entities, mingling of the mental and the physical is standard practice in the RV.

 Because of its position within the NP *víśvā áti dvíṣaḥ*, *áti* is probably not a preverb in tmesis, but rather an adposition. This view is supported by the fact that there are no other exx. of *áti √tan* in the RV (as Re points out) or elsewhere, at least acdg. to Mon-Wms.

 The position of *anyā̀ḥ* identifies the sisters as a defined and limited group, and of course, as the next vs. states (10b *saptásvasā*), Sarasvatī has precisely seven sister rivers.

VI.61.10: On tṛca-introducing *utá* see ad 7 above.

 We might expect the splv. *priyátamā* in this construction.

 I don't exactly know how to interpr. the VP *stómyā bhūt*, with injunc. aor. of √bhū (or indic. aor? the Saṃhitā sequence *stómyābhūt* could contain augmented *abhūt*) and the pseudo-gerundive *stómya-*. The same construction is found in vs. 12 *hávyā bhūt* (or *hávyā *abhūt*). In vs. 12 Hoffmann (140) takes it as iterative, presumably because of the āmreḍita *vā́je-vā́je*: "'ist bei jedem Preiskampf anzurufen." But √bhū is a change-of-state verb and the aorist should (in a well-behaved language) be punctual. In both vss. the standing characteristics of Saravatī are being described, so she should not have "*become* one worthy to be praised/invoked," because the just-mentioned characteristics are not new. We might speculate that, because there's no injunctive of √as, in order to express a non-temporally marked copula (as opposed to a nominal sentence with suppressed copula) you have to turn to √bhū and the aorist injunctive. But this seems like a long shot. Ge and Re take it as modal: "… sei … preisenswert"; "soit apte à (recevoir) … la louange" (though Re remarks "*bhūt* au sens d'*abhūt*," without recognizing that the Saṃhitā text could in fact contain *abhūt*). Note that vs. 13 (which is not part of this tṛca) contains a predicated pseudo-gerundive in the same semantic sphere, *upastútyā* 'to be praised', *without* aux.

VI.61.11: In b *urú rájaḥ* 'broad realm' is identical with *antárikṣam* 'midspace'. Perhaps supplying two terms for one place is designed to give the impression of the usual three-termed whole, earth, midspace, heaven — here: earth, midspace x2. The river's physical position presumably precludes claiming that she has filled heaven as well.

VI.61.12: But heaven as part of her domain is apparently smuggled in, without naming it, in *triṣadhásthā* 'having three seats' opening this vs.

The vs. in general is characterized by fairly straightforward numerology: in addition to the three seats, the seven parts are presumably her sister rivers and "five peoples" is the familiar expression for the totality of the Ārya. The 1ˢᵗ vs. of the tṛca inaugurated the numerology with *saptásvasā* 'having seven sisters'.

On *hávyā bhūt* see comm. ad vs. 10.

VI.61.13: The sequence *mahínāsu* is perfectly ambiguous. It can be a fem. loc. pl. of the poorly attested them. stem *mahína-*, as I take it in the publ. tr. and as Old is inclined to do. Or, with Pp., Ge, and Re, it can be disjoined into *mahínā āsu*, nom. sg. fem. to the same rare them. stem and loc. pl. fem. to the near-deictic pronoun, unaccented because the referent is in the discourse. (Gr actually lists both *mahínā* and *mahínāsu* for this passage.) The difference in meaning is minimal: my "… who by her greatness shines … among the great (rivers)" versus "the great one who by her greatness shines … among the (rivers)." I now find that I am more disposed to go with the Pp. analysis, for reasons of wordplay, not meaning. The instr. *mahimnā* in this passage is one of only three exx. of this form in the RV, with the restored -*mn*- cluster to the stem *mahimán*- -- against well-attested instr. *mahinā* with the (old) cluster reduction of -*mn*- to -*n*-. If we accept the Pp. interpr., the adjacent words *mahimnā mahínā* would implicitly play on both forms of the instr., with the nom. sg. *mahínā* differing from the standard instr. *mahinā* only by accent. If we instead take *mahínāsu* as a loc., that play is lost or at least considerably diluted.

The construction of b, esp. of *anyāḥ*, rests on that of 9ab.

On *upastútyā* see comm. ad vs. 10.

VI.61.14: In b the standard tr. (Ge, Re; cf. also Hoffmann 48) take *páyasā* with the 2ⁿᵈ cl.: "do not come up short with your milk." However, *mā́* is almost always clause-initial, whereas this interpr. requires it to come in 2ⁿᵈ position, with the enclitic *naḥ* even further into the clause. Moreover, no other forms of √*dagh* are construed with an instr. Instead I take *ápa spharīḥ* as intransitive 'spring away', with *páyasā* a species of instr. of accompaniment or, perhaps, an instr. of separation.

VI.62 Aśvins

The first part of the hymn is marked by repeated dual prns. opening the vs. or hemistich: 1c *yā́*, 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a *tā́*, 5c *yā́*, 6a *tā́*. This pattern more or less coincides with the division of the hymn discussed in the publ. intro. After the beg. of vs. 6 the pattern is broken and does not reappear.

VI.62.1: The usual ambiguity of *jára-* 'awake' or 'sing', with the usual possible double application in a context like this, though *járamāṇasya* in 4a speaks for 'sing'.

In his n. 1d Ge hesitates about the root affiliation of the desid. *yúyūṣataḥ* (√*yu* 'join' or √*yu* 'separate') and the function of *pári* (preverb or adposition). Although his tr. reflects a root affiliation to 'join' ("… zu umspannen suchen"), he offers an alternative tr. in the n.

reflecting 'separate' ("… fortzurücken suchen"), an interpr. followed by Heenen (Desid. 209). Such an interpr. would be conceptually possible: in the dim light of dawn and the morning mists, the Aśvins allow the boundaries of earth to be seen by "separating" them. However, I consider √*yu* 'join' more likely, in the sense, with *pári*, of 'encompass', referring to the usual round-the-world journey of the Aśvins. The constr. seems a conflation or crossing of the usual *sadyáḥ* [H+E] *pári* √*i/yā* [/VERB OF MOTION] expression "encircle heaven and earth in a single day," as in I.115.3, 128.3, III.58.8, IV.45.7, etc., with the prior act of harnessing (√*yu*) the horses. For passages that incl. *ántān* (as here), see V.47.4, X.108.5: e.g., V.47.4 *diváś caranti pári sadyó ántān* "They circle around the ends of heaven in a single day."

VI.62.2: This vs. presents both number and person disagreement, the first more acute than the second. As noted above, the vs. begins with the dual NA prn. *tā́*, surely referring to the Aśvins, and this 1ˢᵗ pāda ends with an apparent dual part. *cakramāṇā́* presumably modifying the prn. But the next pāda contains a plural verb *rurucuḥ* (*rurucū* in sandhi), which cannot take the dual as subject -- nor as object. (Because of its sandhi position *cakramāṇā́* could instead reflect underlying pl. -*ā́ḥ*, but the initial *tā́* seems almost designed to anchor the participle as dual as well.) Curiously both Ge and Kü (431) tr. the dual NP as subj. of the pl. verb without comment -- either because of a rare grammatical lapse on their parts or because they view it (without comment) as an example of improper agreement. (It is certainly true that a dual *rurucatuḥ would be metrically disastrous, so lax haplology would be thinkable.)

 I believe that we must take the number and the number disharmony seriously, and I therefore take pādas a and b as separate clauses. The first lacks a finite verb. We can either consider the participle as predicated ("they two [are] striding …") or, my preference, as pendant to 1cd, with dual its subj. As noted in the publ. intro., there is another likely enjambment between vss. 2 and 3. The next question is the identity of the pl. subj. of d. There is one pl. form in pāda a: instr. pl. *śúcibhiḥ*. Ge and Kü take this as referring to the *rájobhiḥ* 'spaces' in b, but Re suggests that it ancitipates the horses (*áśvaiḥ*) in 3bc. If we accept Re's identification of the 'gleaming ones' as horses, this provides a possible pl. subj. for *rurucuḥ*. As gleaming ones themselves, they could "shine the radiant beam of the chariot" through the spaces. This may make them sound a little like Rudolph the Red-Nosed Reindeer, but at least it avoids a grammatical solecism.

 The ps. disagreement is, by contrast, very mild and standard RVic practice: the dual subj. returns in 2cd but as 2ⁿᵈ ps. rather than 3rd, as we learn by the verb *yāthaḥ* late in pāda d.

 Note c *purū́ várāṃsi*, a rhyme form to *urū́ várāṃsi* ending 1d.

VI.62.3: This vs. presents a different type of grammatical disharmony, though it again concerns how to construe the first pāda. Once again it begins with du. *tā́*, but in this case that prn. *can* be the subj. of the 2ⁿᵈ dual pf. *ūhathuḥ*. (Though by my rules,= I would prefer not to have a 3ʳᵈ ps. prn serving as subj. to a non-imperatival verb [see my "sa figé"], I do have to reckon with a fairly clear ex. in 6ab.) The problems lie in 1) *vartíḥ* 'circuit' and 2) *yád*. To begin with the 2ⁿᵈ, if *yád* is functioning as a subordinating conjunction and ab is a single

clause, *ūhathuḥ* in b should be accented. (It is not clear to me what Ge does with the *yád*; he seems just to ignore it.) Now *yád* is badly positioned for a clausal subordinator, and it is possible that rather than being a subordinating conjunction it's functioning as a sort of izafe in the phrase *tyád vartír yád áradhram*, connecting the adj. *áradhram* to *vartíḥ*. I would be inclined to that interpr. if it weren't for the problem of *vartíḥ* itself. This noun is always the complement of the verb √*yā* in the phrase "drive the/a/your circuit," incl. in this same hymn, 10ab … *vartíḥ* … *yātam*, and in the next one, with phraseology similar to ours, VI.63.2 *pári ha tyád vartír yāthaḥ* … It would be very difficult to make it the obj. of *ūhathuḥ*, which already has an obj. of its own in any case. But the preceding pāda, 2d, has a form of √*yā*, and I suggest that we simply supply it in 3a as well, which is again pendant on the preceding vs. By this interpr., subordinating *yád* is still badly positioned, but it could have been displaced by the insistently fronted *tā́* in this section of the hymn. I take *áradhram* as a neut. adv., but it could also modify *vártiḥ* ("unslackening circuit") without benefit of an izafe.

The lexeme *pári* √*śi* means lit. 'lie around' and is used, e.g., of Vṛtra surrounding the flood in IV.19.2, etc. Assuming that *śayádhyai, pári* here belongs to the same lexeme, it must have a developed sense: to surround and thus circumscribe, keep within bounds. Why a "pious mortal" would be pursuing a course that needs such control is not clear to me. I suppose it could just mean that, since the Aśvins circle around the earth (1cd), that circle marks the boundaries of where humans can wander.

Note the echo effect of *vártiḥ* (a) / *vyáthiḥ* (d).

VI.62.4: As noted ad vs 1., *járamāṇa-* here seems to belong to 'sing', not 'awaken', and therefore may limit the form in 1b as well. Based on 1b *huve járamāṇaḥ* "singing, I call upon" and 5b *ā́ vivāse* "I seek to attract," I have supplied a 1st ps. referent for the genitives here.

The bahuvrīhi *yuyujāná-saptī* 'having a harnessed team, having a team that has been harnessed' is unusual in having a middle pf. part. as its first member. (See AiG II.1.43.) The publ. tr. "having harnessed their team," though it follows both Gr and Ge, is misleading: I do not think it is a *bharád-vāja-*, *codayán-mati* type governing cmpd. I would therefore emend to "having a harnessed team," with the occasional pass. value of the med. pf. to √*yuj*; see Kü (407). However, things may be somewhat more complex. There are four occurrences of this med. part., one nearby in VI.59.5, three in the same metrical position as here (immed. after an opening of 5). All of them are transitive. It is possible that a free phrase like **yuyujānā́ sáptī* "the two having yoked their teams" became univerbated and reinterpreted, with adjustment of accent and the like. But I do not insist on this.

In d *pratnáḥ* 'age-old' qualifying the priest contrasts with *návyas-* 'newer' in a, qualifying the singer, as well as *yúvānā* 'two youths' in d referring to the Aśvins. The first pair recurs in the next vs., 5b. See comm. there.

VI.62.5: The stems *návyas-* 'newer' and *pratná-* 'age-old', found at opposite ends of the preceding vs. (a and d), are juxtposed here in the phrase *pratnā́ návyasā*, in case the duller members of the audience had missed the contrastive terminology in 4. But this phrase is doing two other things as well: du. *pratnā́* refers to the Aśvins, who were, in 4d, identified

as *yúvānā* 'youths'; and *návyasā* modifies *vácasā*, "with a newer speech," repairing the slightly off phrase in 4a, where it was the singer, not his song, who was newer.

The pf. *babhūvátuḥ* should not have been rendered as a straight pres. in the publ. tr. I would change to "who have become." It also forms a slight figure with *śámbhaviṣṭhā*, which precedes it immediately before the pāda break.

VI.62.6: As noted ad vs. 3, I would prefer not to have the 3ʳᵈ ps. prn. *tā́* serving as a subject of an indicative 2ⁿᵈ ps. verb (pf. *ūhathuḥ*), but the repetitive *tā́* pattern may have imposed it here.

The adj. *areṇú-* 'dustless' (8x) twice qualifies 'paths' (I.35.11, 163.6); the latter of these passages is in the instr. pl. as here. This suggests that *yójanebhiḥ* 'treks' is used here as a near synonym for 'paths'.

Ge takes *bhujántā* to √*bhuj* 'benefit, enjoy → utilize' (benutzen), but better, with Gr, Re, Lub, to √*bhuj* 'bend'. In any case this participle is clearly meant to echo the name Bhujyu.

VI.62.7: In d I take *íti* as a summarizing device, indicating that the three exploits sketched in abc are examples of the Aśvins' *sumatí-*. With Ge I see no choice but to supply a verb like 'you showed' to govern the acc. *sumatím*.

As is clear to all, *cyávānā* is at the least a play on the name Cyavāna (same accent), another client of the Aśvins.

VI.62.8: The grammatical identity of *bhū́mā* (Pp. *bhŭma*) is disputed. Ge considers it to belong to a (hapax) adj. stem *bhŭman-* derived from *bhūmán-* 'abundance', used adverbially ("reichlich"). This does not seem to have much to recommend it. More appealing is to make it somehow related to a word for 'earth'. Re tries an instr. of *bhŭman-* 'earth', but not with much conviction. Old rehearses -- mostly to firmly reject -- other possibilities, incl. the one that I favor: that it is the loc. of *bhŭmi-*. He objects that we should expect (and do indeed get) *bhŭmyām* to this fem. stem, but at this period I don't think this would be necessary for a fem. short-*i*-stem. His other object is more cogent, that to a short-*i*-stem we would expect *bhŭmau* pāda-final. I don't have a clinching arg. against this, but would point out that there is some variation in these patterns. And this pāda seems to be playing with the heaven / earth distinction by other means: we first have the two world halves (*rodasī*), followed by *(pra-)dívaḥ … bhŭmā*, which distantly evokes *dyā́vā-bhŭmī*. The off-balance pairing is matched by the off-balance pairing of gods and mortals discussed immediately below.

The conjoined NP *devā́nām utá martyatrā́* "of gods and among mortals" shows the familiar god / mortal opposition, but what Klein (DGRV I.311–12) calls "a peculiar absence of morphological parallelism." It is tempting to make it mean "the anger *of* the gods *towards* mortals," but I think *utá* is there precisely to block that reading, *pace* Scar (429) "Den Groll der Götter … der auch auf die Sterblichen gerichtet …ist."

VI.62.9: As noted in the publ. intro., the syntax of this vs. is unregulated. However, the sense is quite clear. The first hemistich consists of a rel. clause, whose rel. prn. and finite

verb are both in the 3rd sg.: *yáḥ … cíketat* "who will keep watch"; it also contains another verbal form, *vidádhat*, which I take, with Ge and Old, as a pres. part. nom. sg. m. to the redupl. pres. of √*dhā*, but which could be, as Old points out, a short-vowel subjunctive (so, "… will regulate … and will keep watch"). (Nothing rides on the choice.) But this happy singular environment is interrupted by a dual nom./acc. (which must be nom. in this case) *rājānau* "two kings," which is further specified by the two nom. singulars *mitró váruṇaḥ*. The sense is clearly "which one (of) the two kings, M (or) V …," but this is not what it says: "which one, the two kings, Mitra, Varuṇa, will keep watch," leaving the audience to choose what subject, in what number, it prefers.

   I take *rájasaḥ* as the gen. obj. of *cíketat* (so also Old), in the usual syntactic pattern of verbs of perception, which can take acc. or gen. complements. By contrast, Ge has it dependent on *rājānāu*, but, as Re points out, the two are rather distant, and further I know of no other passages in which *rájas-* is construed with *rájan-*, although that expression would be appealingly alliterative -- though it is true that M+V are called *dhartārā rájasaḥ* "upholders of the space" in V.69.4.

   The second hemistich has no direct syntactic connection to the first, though again it is quite clear what is meant. It contains a 2nd sg. impv. *asya* 'hurl', which must be addressed to the referent of the rel. prn. in ab -- that is, either Mitra or Varuṇa. Although it is common to change person reference even within RVic vss., it is somewhat unusual to do so in this kind of syntagm.

   In d Re calls the phrase *dróghāya cid vácase* a bahuvrīhi "défait," for **drogha-vacas-* [he gives no accent], like *drogha-vắc-*. Judging from his tr. "auf den gar verlogenen Anuiden," Ge seems to agree. But this seems unnec.; the dative targets of the missile in c and d are both *s*-stem abstracts, *rákṣas-* 'demonic power' and *vácas-* 'speech' respectively. I see no reason to try to manipulate the target in d to be personal. Scar (469) interpr. as I do.

VI.62.10: I supply 'to prosper' with *tánayāya* on the basis of nearby VI.49.5 (=I.183.3) … *iṣayádhyai, vartír yāthás tánayāya tmáne ca*, with very similar phraseology.

   I take pāda c with ab, rather than with d, as is the norm (Ge, Kü [509]), in order to capture the opposition between *ántara-* 'nearer' and *sánutya-* 'distant'. Cf., e.g., VI.5.4, which has both *ántara-* and *sánutya-* as well as *vanuṣyá-*. By my interpr. the Aśvins are urged to come near to us, "because of the distant dereliction of a(nother) mortal" -- that is, because some other mortal, far away, hasn't done his ritual duty, they should come to us, who will. I suppose I could construct a way to take c with d: some mortal's dereliction of duty would cause the Aśvins to chop off some heads. But I find it easier to account for c as presented. The last, independent pāda just takes part in the general bloodthirstiness of the last few vss.

   Against Ge, who takes it to √*vṛj*, I assign *vavṛktam* to √*vraśc* 'hew', along with Whit (Rts), Gr, Re, and Kü, inter alia. Cf. the clinching parallel in X.87.16 *téṣāṃ śīrṣáṇi … ápi vṛśca*.

VI.62.11: As noted in the publ. intro., the last phrase of the hymn, *gṛṇaté citrarātī* "you two providing bright gifts for the singer" exactly repeats the end of vs. 5, which marked a transition in the earlier part of the hymn.

VI.63 Aśvins

The hymn contains many metrical irregularities and a marked tendency towards 10-syl. lines. See Old for details and disc.

VI.63.2: The abl. (or, in principle, gen.) *riṣáḥ* is a bit hard to construe. Whenever this form occurs elsewhere (and it's not rare), it is with a form of either √*pā* or √*rakṣ*: "protect from harm." Ge supplies 'protect' here as well: "(zum Schutz) gegen Schaden." However, in the absence of a lexical 'protect' and in the presence of a verb of motion (*yāthaḥ*), I take it as an ablative of place from which.

VI.63.3: There is no expressed subj. to *ákāri* and the abl./gen. *ándhasaḥ* has nothing to depend on. Ge takes it as a partitive gen. (n. 3a) but simply tr. as an indef. subject ("Trank ist euch bereitet"), while Re takes it as belonging to an elliptical construction and suggests supplying either *sutám* or *pāntam*. I prefer to assume that the subject of *ákāri* has been gapped, and *ándhasaḥ* is an abl. of source.

In this context I take *várīman* 'in/on the expanse' as referring to the ritual ground on which the barhis has been strewn, rather than simply Ge's "in voller Breite." See *váriman* in 11.

vavande is of course ambig. as to person, but given the 1st ps. in 2a and no intermediate 3rd ps. officiant, it is most likely 1st (so also Ge).

In real-world terms the phrase "the stones have anointed you" is, of course, distinctly peculiar. But in the foreshortened universe of RVic discourse, this simply abbreviates the sequence "the stones pressed out the soma liquid, which was prepared for you to drink, and your drinking of it was as if it were anointing you (and perhaps did, by running down your chins)."

VI.63.4: The 'gift' (*rātí-*) in b is the ladle containing the ghee. Re points to passages (III.19.2, IV.6.3) where the ladle is described as *rātín-* 'possessing/providing gifts'.

In d Ge takes *áyukta* as passive, with the Hotar as subj. and *nāsatyā* as the obj. of a loc. inf. *hávīman*: "der eingespant is, die Ns zu laden." The pass. interpr. is explicitly rejected by both Old and Re, in favor of a rendering like mine. Although Ge's interpr. is appealing in certain ways, there are several things against it: 1) the well-attested mid. root aor. of √*yuj* is almost always transitive (pass. *áyukta* in V.17.3, I.48.7) -- there is after all a distinct passive aor. *áyoji*, *áyujran* to express this function; 2) I know of no instances (nor does Old) in which loc. *hávīman(i)* functions as an infin. and takes an object.

VI.63.6: I assume that "the flourishing of Sūryā" is simply an elaborate way of saying Sūryā. Ge (n. 6b; fld. by Re) suggests that it is meant to convey that the beauty of Sūryā increases the beauty of the Aśvins but I don't see this. I take the dat. *śubhé* in the same way as *śriyé* (5a and commonly elsewhere, e.g., in the next hymn VI.64.1), *vápuṣe* (6c), as vaguely attached datives of purpose/result.

The latter (*vápuṣe*) Ge takes adverbially ("erstaunlich"), and he construes *vām* simply as a poss. gen. ("Eure Vogel(rosse)"). I think there is more content here and take *ánu* with

vām ("after/following you"), separated because *vām* is taking Wackernagel's position. The beautiful chariot of the beautiful Aśvins carrying the beautiful Sūryā must have been an amazing sight, and the birds in their wonder follow it. As their relative geographical positions indicate (birds after chariot), I think these birds are not, or not only, the Vogelrosse pulling the Aśvins chariot, but also the birds in the world who see the marvel and rise up to accompany it. The songs of the birds in a choir (*vắṇī*) reach the Aśvins to make them well-praised (*súṣṭutā*). As this indicates, I take *súṣṭutā* as dual (so also Gr, Ge), a proleptic adj. describing the state of the Aśvins after the birdsongs reach them. However, as Ge points out (n. 6d), *súṣṭutā* could also be a nom. sg. fem. modifying *vắṇī* 'choir, music', and the adj. is in fact strategically placed between the nom. sg. fem. and the duals. Although a "well-praised choir" doesn't make a lot of sense in this context, Ge cites VIII.100.11 … *vắk* … *súṣṭutā* -- though it's worth pointing out that in that passage the reference is to the *goddess* Speech, while in our passage, as noted, I take the *vắṇī* as referring to the "choir" of birdsong.

VI.63.7: As noted in the publ. intro., the chariot journey in this vs. echoes the mythological one in vs. 6 but updated to a wish for the present day.

Ge divides the 2nd hemistich into two separate clauses, by pāda. In this interpr. the nouns in d are in the nom. pl. and follow the Aśvins' chariot that was launched in c ("viele Labsale … folgen ihm"). The publ. tr. takes the two pādas as a single cl., with the nouns in d in the acc. pl. and the chariot following them. Neither of these conjures up an entirely comfortable picture if *ánu* is strictly 'following' – either all the good stuff got left behind and has been sent after the chariot, or it's all zipping along ahead. But my accusative alternative could be taken to mean that the refreshments et al. are already at the ritual ground. This would be supported by ab, esp. b. But it is contra-indicated by VI.62.4 in the immediately preceding Aśvin hymn, where *pṛ́kṣam* and *íṣam* are two of the things the Aśvins are bringing. However, if *iṣídh-* is a variant of *niṣṣídh-* 'tribute' (see below), the first of these alternatives is the more likely.

The hapax *iṣídh-* is of uncertain formation and meaning, though it obviously falls into the category of desirable things at the ritual. There are (at least) two competing etymologies. One has it as the doublet of *niṣṣídh-* 'tribute' (for lit. see EWA I.198; favored by Re); the other (see EWA I.200) as a deformation of a putative *iṣudh-*, like the likewise hapax *pṛkṣúdh-* (I.141.4), serving as the base of the denom. *iṣudhyá-* and cognate to Aves. *išud-*. The *ud(h)-* in these forms is explained by Humbach as the zero-grade of the PIE root √*ṷedh* 'lead', no longer found in Indo-Aryan as a verbal root. (I suggest an alternative etym. of *iṣudhyá-* ad I.128.6.) Narten (YH 159-63) accepts Humbach's etym. and further explains our *iṣídh-* as altered from *iṣúdh-* by folk etymology with √*idh* 'kindle, burn' (162 n. 104) in passages in which the word is connected with Agni. This last seems quite weak to me: 'burn' contributes no obvious semantics to the noun at least in its only occurrence here -- which has nothing to do with Agni -- and the *iṣudhyá-* forms, though not numerous, ought to provide some anchor against such a deformation. For this reason I tentatively follow the first interpr., though only because nothing better seems to be currently on offer. If *iṣídh-* is somehow a doublet of *niṣṣídh-*, which occurs several times with *pūrvīḥ* (III.51.5, VI.44.11) as here, then the reference would be to the tributes that the Aśvins received from the mortal

worshippers. I would now alter the tr. to "… after the refreshments, fortifying powers, and the many tributes."

VI.63.8: The hapax *ásakrām* is another proleptic adj. (see 6d). This fem. sg. can apply equally to the two fem. sgs. *dhenúm* and *iṣám*.

   The *ánu* that has not yielded completely satisfactory sense in 6c and 7d here is entirely at home: the various ritual offerings to the Aśvins, both verbal (*stútaḥ … suṣṭutíḥ*) and physical (*rásāḥ*, the soma juices), accrue to them *following* the gift they bestow on the sacrificers.

VI.63.9: Although in the publ. tr. I accept Ge's interpr. of *pakvá* as 'cooked (food)' (so also Gr, Hoffmann [231], Klein [DGRV I.97], Scar [587]), in this mass of valuable livestock I now find it unlikely that the poet would memorialize for posterity the gift of a few ready-prepared meals. It is more likely to be a technical term in animal husbandry -- perhaps 'mature(d)' (< 'ripened'), qualifying horses or cattle of a particular age. Although it is neut. pl. and therefore can't qualify the animals directly, I suggest that parallel to sg. *śatám* in the conjoined phrase *sumīḷhé śatám peruké ca pakvá*, we may supply **śatǎ(ni) *gávām pakvá* "mature hundreds of cows" for "*hundreds of mature cows." A similar constr. seems to be suggested by Gr (Nachtr. to *śatá-*), where he proposes that *pakvá* be construed with *śatám* as an ex. of his 10) "der Singular neben einem in gleichem Casus stehenden Substantiv des Plurals." Although this particular interpr. seems precluded by the *ca* in the passage, I do think the neut. *pakvá* qualifies a (gapped) neut. numeral. I would now alter the tr. to "and (hundreds) of mature (cows) at (the hands of) Peruka."

   Hoffmann (230–31) interprets the two clauses in the 2nd hemistich as modal, with injunc. *dāt* rendered as 'soll … schenken' and the sandhi form *abhiṣắca* interpr. as an inf. **abhiṣắce* with the sense "soll … folge." This is all in service of his somewhat bizarre insistence that the injunctive aorist doesn't express immediate past tense (aktuelle Vergangenheit), which is, in his view, the province of the *augmented* aorist. At least in my view, Hoffmann's restricted and often non-linguistically grounded model of the injunctive has led him to deny the obvious intent of the dānastuti here: the gift generally needs to have been given to be praised! As for the supposed infinitive **abhiṣắce* (which, it must be admitted, he does not insist on), there are no other such forms, whereas the nom. pl. is attested elsewhere. We must simply accept that it takes verbal rection, here the acc. pl. *ṛṣvăn*; see Scar (587–88).

   On *smáddiṣṭi-* see comm. ad III.45.5.

VI.63.10: As in the immediately preceding vs. Hoffmann (230–31) interprets the two forms of *dāt* as modal, "soll … spenden." The same objections apply.

   The voc. *nāsatyā* was omitted in the publ. tr.

   The voc. *vīra* is stubbornly sg., though the reference must be to the du Aśvins.

VI.63.11: I take loc. *váriman* in the same way as its variant in 3a, as referring to the ritual ground. Ge here: "in weitem Masse," seemingly referring to the patrons.

VI.64 Dawn

VI.64.1: *supátha-* and *sugá-* recur in 4a, conjoined by *utá*.

Note the phonological reciprocity between *víśvā* and *vásvī* in the same metrical position in c and d respectively. The latter is, of course, simply the fem. to *vásu-* 'good, goods', and here it must make at least partial reference to the goods Dawn disburses, she being here the Dakṣiṇā, priestly gift, personified. This could have been better conveyed in the publ. tr. by 'goodly' rather than just 'good'. I think there may also be a buried grammatical pun, for, if there existed such a stem, the *-in-*stem possessive to *vásu-* should be **vasvín-* 'possessing goods', with nom. sg. **vasvī́*, differing from our form only by accent.

It would be possible to construe pāda with *abhūt* and a pred. nom.: "she has become the goodly priestly gift …" But it is common in Dawn hymns to announce the arrival of Dawn in the first verse, and an annunciatory "she has appeared" (< "come into being") is more in harmony with the usual practice of Dawn hymns. This is the tack of the standard tr. (Ge, Re; see also Gonda [Ved. Lit. 218]).

VI.64.3: As Ge points out (n. 3cd), the acc. *śátrūn* must be read as the obj. of both similes and acc. *támaḥ* 'darkness' as the obj. of both frames, though the former only appears in c and the latter in d. The two similes compare Dawn not only to a male figure, but to a skillful, highly trained male warrior: archer and chariot-driver.

In c the simile marker *iva* occurs after the 2nd term, not the 1st (might expect **śū́ra ivā́stā śátrūn*). Perhaps *śū́ra- ástar-* is perceived as a unity, "champion archer"; cf. I.70.11 *ásteva śū́raḥ*, IV.36.6 *śū́ro ástā*, I.8.4 *śū́rebhir ástṛbhiḥ*, and, with lexical substitution, II.42.2 *vīró ástā*. There is also the fact that in similes with three terms matching two different cases, there's some fluctuation in the position of the simile marker.

VI.64.4: For *sugá- supátha-* see vs. 1.

Ge suggests that *avāté* "(even) when it is windless" describes a wonder, that Dawn crosses the water even without wind in her sails. I am not sure what evidence we have for sails, in addition to oars, in ancient Indian boats, but I have not systematically inquired into this. However, the "windless" circumstances might simply make reference to the previous pāda: the waters are also *sugá-* 'easy to travel' when there is no wind and therefore no turbulence. The word *avāté* also plays off the descriptor of Dawn in the next vs. (5a), *ávātā* 'unsurpassable, unvanquished'; Old in fact suggests that we might read **ávāte*, voc. of the latter stem, though a word play is much more satisfying poetically, and he does not dismiss the 'windless' interpr. out of hand.

VI.64.5: The beginning of the first pāda, *sā́ ā́* [so Pp., Saṃhitā *sā́*] *vaha yā́*, replicates almost exactly the beginning of 4c, *sā́ na ā́ vaha*. The close similarity of the two openings supports the disjoining of *sā́* in 5a into *sā́ ā́*, which is also required by the meter.

As noted above, nom. sg. fem. *ávātā* 'unvanquished, unsurpassable' plays on the loc. *avāté* 'windless' in 4b. The neg. stem *ávāta-* is generally paired with the positive pres. part. *vanván*, in the phrase *vanvánn ávātaḥ* "winning but unwon" (5x, incl. VI.16.20, 18.1 in this

maṇḍala). But here and in nearby VI.67.8 it is found in the fem. and outside of the contrastive pair. In neither of these passages is the application of the adjective clear. I have therefore, somewhat reluctantly, adopted a version of Re's attenuated 'insurpassable' (which, however, he seems to reject in his n.).

Both Ge and Re take cd as a unified rel. cl. (e.g., "die du als Göttin ... erschienen bist"), but this is impossible, because *bhūḥ* is unaccented. I instead attach c to ab, and take d as an independent imperatival clause. I now see that it would be possible to take cd together, with the nominal rel. cl. *yā ha devī* acting as an izafe; as noted elsewhere (passim) such izafe-like rel. phrases can be embedded. This would produce a tr. "You, who are a goddess, o daughter of heaven, become worthy to be seen …," with no appreciable difference in meaning. It might then be better to stick with the arrangement of the publ. tr.

VI.64.6: This vs. is identical to I.124.12.

Pāda b may contain another izafe-like embedded rel. construction, like the possible one in 5c: *náraś ca yé pitubhǎjaḥ* "and the men who are partakers of food." The question turns on where to construe hemistich-final *vyùṣṭau*. It could belong to the rel. cl. "… partake of food at the first flush," in which case there would be no embedding. But it seems as if this temporal designation should apply to both actions: the flying up of the birds and the eating of the men, not just the latter. Moreover *te* in 2nd pos. of the hemistich is most easily construed with *vyùṣṭau* at the end, in which case the nominal rel. must be embedded.

This hemistich also seems syntactically unbalanced. If we assume that we have an "X and which Y" construction, conjoining birds and men (so Klein, DGRV I.56), they should be the joint subject of *úd … apaptan* 'have flown up', an action appropriate to the first group but not the second. Surely the real intent is that at the moment of dawn the birds fly up and the men eat, so what is intended to be conjoined are the two verbal notions, with one a finite verb and the other the 2nd member of a root noun cmpd. (on which see Scar 352).

VI.65 Dawn

VI.65.1: As Re points out, the expected expression is *duhitā diváḥ* "daughter of heaven," but it has been elaborated here by the cmpd *divojāḥ* 'born of heaven', with the gen. as 1st member. The standard phrase returns in the last vs.

This vs. piles on the words for night and darkness: *rāmyāsu … támasaś cid aktūn* "amid the nights … even across the nocturnal shades of darkness."

VI.65.2: The same emphasis on the dark night is found here in *táma ūrmyāyāḥ* (with acc. *támaḥ* as head noun, against the dep. gen. *támasaḥ* in the previous vs. (1d). With *ūrmyā-* here the poet introduces yet another 'night' word.

VI.65.3–4: There is lexical chaining between 3d and 4a with the identical phrase *vidhaté rátnam* in the same metrical position.

VI.65.4–5: For the repeated opening *idā* (4a, 4b, 4c, 5a) see publ. intro. The two outer exx. are both *idā hí*; the two inner ones are followed by phonologically similar them. datives: 4b

idā vīrā́ya | 4c *idá víprāya*.

VI.65.6: The voc. *divo duhitar* repairs, or "de-elaborates," the phrase in 1a; see ad loc.

VI.66 Maruts
  On the difficulties and with an overview of the Maruts' birth story in vss. 1–5, see publ. intro. The hymn was treated at length by P. von Bradke, "Von der Marut wunderbarer Geburt, R̥V 6, 66" in Fs. von Roth (1893)**,** 117–25, whose disc. is in great part incorporated into Old's notes.

VI.66.1: This vs. is conceptually, lexically, and syntactically similar to VI.48.22; see extensive disc. ad loc., with ref. to other passages alluding to this mythological event.
  For *nā́ma pátya-* "own a name," cf. II.37.2 *dadír yó nā́ma pátyate* "who owns the name 'giver'," adduced by Re.
  The 2ⁿᵈ hemistich consists of a truncated *anyá-* … *anyá-* construction, with the 2ⁿᵈ *anyá-* gapped. This implicitly contrastive structure must account for the accent on *pīpáya* in the first clause.
  Contra the standard interpr. (Old, Ge, Re), I take *śukrám* and *ū́dhaḥ* separately, as the double acc. obj. of √*duh*, rather than having the former an adj. modifying 'udder', also in other relevant passages that contain the same two words (II.34.2, IV.3.10).

VI.66.2: For a more complex comparison of the Maruts to fire(s), see vs. 10.
  In c, where the gen. pl. *eṣā́m* seems to preclude the Maruts as referent of the nom. pl. *areṇávo hiraṇyáyāsaḥ*, Sāy. supplies *ráthāḥ*, and this might be possible or at least harmless, although the positive evidence for it is slim. The 2nd adj. *hiraṇyáya-* is used not infrequently of chariots or their parts (wheels, wheel-rims), but also of a wide range of other things, including gods and those include the Maruts (V.87.5); 'dustless' has a more limited range of application. In nearby VI.62.6 it qualifies *yójanebhiḥ*, rendered there as 'treks' and, as I argue ad loc., a near synonym for 'paths', which are twice described as 'dustless' (I.35.11, 163.6). This is as close as we'll get to chariots: in its 8 occurrences it is never used of chariots or parts thereof. It is, however, used of the Maruts in I.168.4. Because chariots are intrusive in our passage and interrupt the otherwise constant reference to the Maruts in the nom. pl. (ab and, in my opinion, d) and because the combination of adjectives doesn't point to chariots -- or any referent *but* the Maruts, who are described by both adjectives elsewhere -- I now think the nom. plurals in c refer to the Maruts. What then to do with *eṣā́m*? I propose construing it with the instrumentals in d. The pāda boundary intervenes, but this is hardly fatal. I would now emend the tr. to "dustless and golden, they came into being all at once with their *(eṣā́m)* manly and male powers."
  However, *pace* Ge and Re, even if we were to keep 'chariots' as the referent in c, I do not think these same chariots could be the subj. of d. Rather, by that interpr., c is parenthetic and the Maruts return as subj. in d, which again treats the topic of their simultaneous birth. Ge's parallels (see n. 2cd) contravene his tr. ("ihre staublosen goldigen (Wagen) sind zugleich mit ihren Manneskräften und Stärken entstanden") because the parallel passages with *sākám* √*jan* (etc.) all concern the birth of the Maruts—certainly not

their chariots!

Pāda-init. *sākám* plays off identically position *sakŕt* in 1d.

VI.66.3: There is much disagreement about this vs.; my interpr. is closest to Old. In my opinion (and in Old's too, though he doesn't use the term 'gender-bending'), this once again, as in vs. 1, refers to the gender-bending androgyny of Pŕśni who fulfills both maternal and paternal roles in the birth of the Maruts, though Rudra is identified as their father in pāda a.

The masc. pl. rel. pronouns *yé* (a) and *yā́n* (b) have no direct correlative in either c or d. But both the gen. sg. *maháḥ* in c (see below) and *subhvè* in d (see below) pick up the masc. pl. conceptually. For a similar -- and clearer -- example see vs. 9, with ab referring to the Marut troop in the sg., and cd picking up that reference with pl. rel. prn. *yé* (c) and a pl. abl. noun (d).

In b, despite the lack of an identifying gendered pronoun or adj., the subject and the referent of *dā́dṛviḥ* must be Pŕśni, as is generally agreed.

In c Old discusses the possible interpr. of *maháḥ* at some length. Much depends on the analysis of *vidé*. Ge takes it as transitive ("denn die Mutter kennt ihre Grossen"), with *maháḥ* acc. pl.; Re as well, though with a diff. interpr. of *maháḥ*. But *vidé* is overwhelmingly pass.-intrans.; only VII.40.5, cited by Ge (n. 3c) seems to require a transitive interpr. I take *vidé* in its usual passive sense and interpr. *maháḥ* as a gen. sg. dependent on *mātā́*; the sg. referent is the collectivity of the Maruts in their flock.

Note the allit. in c: *mātā́ mahó mahī́* and the etymological relationship between the last two terms. Note also the unusual pāda-final position of *sā́*, which may result both from being displaced by the alliterative sequence (though why not 1st position) and from the desire for the striking repetitive *ṣā́, sā́* over the pāda and clause boundary. This repetition is enhanced by the matching vowels before and after: *(mah)ī́ ṣā́, sā́ í(t)*. This is only one of two rukied *ṣā́*'s in the RV (the other = X.64.15 #*ví ṣā́*), even though *sā́* occurs elsewhere in ruki environment (even pāda-finally, as in VIII.27.18 ... *nú sā́*#). I do not understand the reason for the ruki: there does not seem to be particularly close syntactic nexus between *mahī́* and *sā́* here.

Pāda d fully expresses the gender paradox, at least by my interpr. (and Old's). As noted in the publ. intro., *gárbham* √*dhā* 'place the embryo' is the defining idiom of the male role in pregnancy, and here it is difficult (but not impossible!) to avoid taking its subject to be the female Pŕśni. In fact, both Ge and Re (tr.) do wriggle out of it, by making *sét* [= *śā́ íd*] *pŕśniḥ* a nominal sentence (Re's "elle (s'appelle) Pŕśni" has a particularly peculiar charm) and supplying Rudra as the subj. of the idiom. But there is no support for this in the passage, and only insistence on expected gender roles can impose the interpr. Indeed the init. *sā́ íd* draws attention to the paradox: "it was *just her* -- Pŕśni -- who emplanted the embryo. (Interestingly, while Re follows the Ge tack in his tr., in his comm. he embraces the paradox: "c'est Pŕśni qui (en fait : *íd*) a mis le germe …" Since the tr. and the comm. are found in the same fascicle of EVP -- X, pp. 40 and 98–99 respectively -- his about-face is head-spinningly rapid. It should also be admitted that Ge [in n. 3d] also allows the possibility of a single clause and a feminine subject.)

This leaves *subhvè*. In the Rudra-as-emplanter scenario, this dat. refers to Pŕśni (see Ge

n. 3d and Re [tr.] "en (l'épouse) feconde," also Scar 369), but part of the reason for Re's change of heart was that he did not believe that *subhvè* could be fem. (see his comm.). In the Pṛśni-as-emplanter scenario *subhvè* would refer to Rudra (so Gr, Old, Re [comm.]). I think neither solution is correct. The cmpd. *subhū-* in the pl. is used a number of times of the Maruts (5.41.13, 55.3, 59.3, 87.3), including once in a birth context: V.55.3 *sākáṃ jātāḥ subhvàḥ* "born all at once, good in essence." As with *mahàḥ* in pāda c I interpr. the singular here as referring to the collectivity of the Maruts.

VI.66.4: Another difficult vs., esp. the end of pāda a: *áyā nú*, which has provoked much disc. (see esp. Old). I consider it a śleṣa. Central to my approach is the assumption that there's a clause break before these two words in either reading. On the one hand, I have adopted von Bradke's clever idea (op. cit., 121), that *áyā nú* is direct speech, with *áyā* the 1st sg. pres. subjunctive to √*i* 'go' followed by the temporal particle *nú* in expected clause-2nd position. This is the collective announcement of the Maruts, "who do not retreat from their birth": "I will go now." They are eager to exit the womb (or udder). We might of course expect a plural verb, but Marut reference always vacillates between pl. and collective sg. (see in fact the immediately preceding vs. 3), and this exact expression echoes that of Indra in the narrative of his unnatural birth in IV.18.2 *nāhám áto nír ayā* "I will not go from here," a narrative that might well have been familiar to all.

The other reading of *áyā* is the more generally accepted one, though I think other interpr. have missed a crucial detail. It is generally taken as the instr. sg. fem. of the *ayám* prn. (back to Max Müller; see Ge n. 4a). But this form is ordinarily accented on the final, *ayā*. Initial accent on the oblique forms of this pronominal stem is restricted to emphatic usage in pāda-initial position (cf. the variant usage of, e.g., *ásya, asyá*, and *asya*). Those like Ge and Re who take it as this instr. but construe it with the rest of pāda a must wave away the accent (or ignore it, as Re does). For such interpr. cf. "Die nicht vor der Geburt *auf diese Art* zurückscheuen …"; "… devant un naissance *de la sorte*" (my italics). However, init. accent is perfectly at home if we assume a clause break before *áyā*, an assumption supported by the position of *nú*, which overwhelmingly takes 2nd or modified 2nd position. I think it emphatically announces the way the birth *really* happened -- and given the unnaturalness of the birth (being "milked out" of their mother), emphasis is certainly called for.

Either of these interpr. seems to require that the *yád* in c actually have domain over b as well (though there might be away out of that if one were sufficiently ingenious), but given the syntactic tangle the vs. is already in and the looseness of the relativization elsewhere in this hymnc) (see a similar problem in the next vs., 5b, this does not seem to me too much of a problem.

In b it is not clear to me what flaws the Maruts needed to purify; Ge (n. 4b) suggests it's the unnatural pregnancy and birth, and he may well be right.

Gr (and Lub) assign *ukṣámānāḥ* to √*ukṣ* 'sprinkle', but 'grow' seems more likely (so also Ge, Re).

Our problematic expression may have spawned the two *ánu* forms (in c and d) from *áyā nú*. The first is in the familiar expression *ánu jóṣam* (II.21.3, etc.) "according to / at pleasure"; the latter I construe with *tanvàm* (cf. I.147.4 *ánu mṛkṣīṣṭa tanvàm*, with similar discontinuity). Neither √*vakṣ* / *ukṣ* nor √*mṛc* otherwise *ánu*.

VI.66.5: This last vs. of the birth saga does not let up on obscurity, and my interpr. differs in part from those of others, though there is general agreement on the point of the vs.; see, e.g., Ge (n. 5): that the Maruts got no milk from their mother, but undeterred, they quickly became the Maruts we know, with their shared name and their tumultuous behavior. It is striking that the vs. also identifies the Maruts with Pṛśni verbally. Not only is the same construction used for their names (1b, 5b; see next para.), but within the vs. both Pṛśni (a) and the Maruts (c) are called *ayā́s-* 'irrepressible' (with this adj. regularly used of the Maruts elsewhere), and *sudā́nu-* 'of good drops/gifts', a standing epithet of the Maruts, is applied to Pṛśni in d (see Ge's n. 5d)

The vs. is also linked ring compositionally with vs. 1. In 1b it is asserted that the two udders referred to in 1c and d — the latter being Pṛśni's udder, which will produce the Maruts as milk — "own the same name 'milker'" (*samānáṃ nā́ma dhenú pátyamānam*), while in 5b the Maruts after birth assume their (shared) name "Marut": *ā́ nā́ma dhṛṣṇú mā́rutaṃ dádhānāḥ* -- note, inter alia, the echo of *dhenú* in *dhṛṣṇú*. Note also 1c / 5a LOC *doháse*: in 1c the other (=non-Pṛśni) udder constantly gives milk (*doháse*) to mortals (*mártesu*), while here in 5a Pṛśni does not give milk (*ná … doháse*) to the Maruts (*yéṣu*) even right after birth -- even though she milked them out of that very udder.

The vs. also has repeated phonological play with *ayā́* (a), *ayā́so* (c), (*áv)a yā́sad* (d), picking up the problematic *áyā* of 4a.

In addition to its other problems, the vs. is metrically troubled, with a bad cadence in a and 9 syllables in c.

Both Ge and Old (and also von Bradke) take *makṣ*ū́ with the b pāda, which requires the rel. cl. of pāda a to be embedded, but I think it goes rather with its own pāda, indicating that even right after their birth Pṛśni deprived them of milk (sim. Re). I then take the *yé* of c to have domain over b as well -- the same aberrant relative placement as suggested for 4bc.

The hapax *stauná-* is, as Re says, "ininterprétable" (which does not stop him from trying). Ge suggests reading **astaunāḥ* (with abhinihita sandhi after *yé* in the Saṃhitā text), deriving it from √*stu* and tr. 'ohne Lob(?)'. Although this has the merit of connecting it to a known root and without phonological disturbance, I find Re's tr. "sans être inertes" (without comm. on the etym., but perhaps based on von Bradke's "Sie stehen nicht still") more appealing in context, since it would provide a satisfying contrast with *ayā́saḥ*: in Re's tr., "eux qui, sans être inertes, (sont bien au contraire) inlassables." I am also struck by the echo pointed out by von Bradke, with our *staunā́* matched by *(ta)sthau ná* in the next vs., 6d. As often, contextual poetics may have led to the choice of an enigmatic word. My own extremely speculative interpr. ("like posts") is that it is related to *sthū́ṇā-* 'pillar', which is well anchored in Iranian (YAves. *stū̆na-*, *stunā-*, OP *stūnā-*, as well as Middle and Mod. Iranian) and found also widely in MIA and NIA (Pā, Pkt *thūṇā*, etc.). This suggestion requires the perhaps counter-intuitive assumption that the aspiration in *sthū́ṇā* is secondary, perhaps based on the MIA form (where initial **st* would of course develop into *th*); the unmotivated retroflex *ṇ* in the Vedic form might give some support to that hypothesis. And secondary (if it *is* secondary) association with √*sthā* 'stand' would also encourage an aspirated initial. Another wrinkle is that it may have trisyllabic scansion (so Gr), but that is further than I can go. For a similarly impenetrable form in this maṇḍala with the same phonological profile, see *staulā́* in VI.44.7 and comm. ad loc.

The last problem in the vs. (or at least the last one I will tackle) is in d: does *nū cid* here mean 'even now' or 'never'. Ge, Re, and von Bradke opt for the latter; Scar (405) gives a choice of both. Although these two choices seem starkly oppositional, they may amount to the same thing with the subjunctive *áva yāsat*: even now she is trying to appease them, and she never will be able to.

VI.66.6: With some relief we can pass on from the clotted vss. containing the Maruts' birth story to the considerably more straightforward terrain of their adult exploits. This vs. is, however, linked to the preceding one: *ugrāḥ* in 6a picks up the last word of 5, *ugrān*. It is also barely possible that *suméke* 'well-fixed' to √*mi* 'fix, implant' resonates with *staunāḥ* in 5c, *if* that means 'post'.

As indicated in the publ. tr., the vs. is also structured by the pun on du. *ródasī* '(two) world halves' and nom. sg. *rodasī́*, the PN of the Maruts' consort, differing only by accent.

As noted by Old and Re, the simile marker *ná* is wrongly positioned, before the simile itself: *ná rókaḥ* rather than expected **róko ná*. Re suggests it is to avoid vs.-final *ná*. But see the disc. above of 5c, with the ref. to von Bradke's happy observation that *(ta)sthau ná* here matches the hapax *staunā(ḥ)* in that pāda, which can easily account for the wrong placement here: the order was adjusted to facilitate the inter-vs. echo. My tr. also reflects my interpr. of *svášociḥ* at the end of previous pāda as part of the postponed simile (*svášociḥ, … ná rókaḥ*# "like a self-blazing light"). Although *svášociḥ* can of course modify *rodasī́*, to which it is adjacent, taking it with the simile would not only put *ná* in expected, if distant, second position, but also produces a more effective simile in my opinion: "like a light" seems pretty lame, as if Rodasī was a glorified headlight, but "like a self-blazing light" has more oomph.

VI.66.7: Both Ge and Re take *pathyã* as the obj. of *sā́dhan* (e.g., "… die rechten Wege nehmend"), but since the former is regularly used, with or without *ánu*, to express extent of space and since the latter can be used absolutely, I prefer my rendering.

VI.66.8: In c, on the basis of VI.31.1 I would adjust the tr. to reflect the formulaic pair *toká-tánaya-* to "progeny and posterity, the waters, and the sun"; see also VI.25.4.

Flg. Ge, Re, and Klein (DGRV II.123, 194), the publ. tr. takes *pā́rye … dyóḥ* as referring to a particular, decisive time or hour of the day (Klein "in the last (hour) of the day"), but I now think it more likely that the phrase is simply a metrically driven variant of *diví* (...) *pā́rʲye / pā́rʲye diví*# "on the decisive day," a locution found quite commonly in the VIth Maṇḍala (VI.17.14, 23.2, 33.5, 40.5; also *pā́rʲye áhan* VI.26.1). In pāda-final position that expression is only appropriate to Jagatī/dimeter cadences. Re makes a similar suggestion in his comm, despite his tr. "à l'heure-décisive du jour." I would therefore slightly emend the publ. tr. to "on the decisive day"; sense supports this change: the act described in this pāda is more likely to be localized to a particularly important day, not a particularly important part of the day.

On the tendency of *ádha* to occur adjacent to locatives, see Klein DGRV II.95.

VI.66.9: For the switch between singular reference to the Marut collectivity in ab and plural

reference to the same group in cd, see disc. ad 3cd.

A particularly insistent etym. figure in c: *sáhāṃsi sáhasā sáhante*. The metrical irreg. of the pāda, with a likely rest at 5 (so HvN), after *sáhāṃsi*, may draw attention to it.

On the address to Agni in d, see comm. ad 10.

VI.66.10: The comparison of the Maruts to fires in 2a (*yé agnáyo ná śóśucann idhānāḥ* "those who kept blazing up like fires being kindled") returns here in the first hemistich with more contorted imagery. In the similes of both a and b the Maruts are compared not directly to fire, but to something that is a metaphor for fire: "the dart of the ceremony" (a) and the more familiar "tongues of fire" (b). The somewhat unexpected invocation of Agni in the last pāda of the preceding vs. (9d) prepares the way for these similes.

In d I have followed Ge and Re in selecting the final word, *ádhṛṣṭāḥ* 'unassailable', as the predicate. But given that the first 5 vss. of the hymn concern the Maruts' birth and that the 1st half of this vs. compares them to fire, I wonder if the predicate is rather *bhrājajjanmānaḥ* 'of flashing birth', as von Bradke takes it: "…... leuchtend ist die Geburt der unwiderstehlichen Marut." The striking phonology (…*j* …*jj*) of the cmpd certainly draws attention to it.

VI.66.11: Note the fairly common *bhrājad-ṛṣṭi-* in a immediately following the identically formed hapax *bhrājaj-janman-* in 10d.

The final pāda has attracted more concerned comment than I think it deserves; see esp. the great fuss Old makes about it. The issue is what to do with the simile containing two nominatives *giráyo nắpaḥ* (= *ná ắpaḥ*), lit. "like mountains, waters." The consensus seems to be that the two noms. convey a single image, with a more complex structure underlying it: namely the waters (of) the mountains, mountain water, Bergwasser. I don't see why this is necessary; instead I think the thoughts are being compared both with moutains and with waters, which are both *ugrá-* in different ways. (Old allows this possibility.)

Note that the adjectives qualifying the inspired thoughts, *śúci-* and *ugrá-*, were used of the Maruts earlier in the hymn, in 4c and 5c, 6a respectively.

VI.67 Mitra and Varuṇa

VI.67.1: The hymn does not start promisingly, with a bad, and unfixable, cadence in pāda a (*jyḗṣṭhatamā*). Pāda c also ends with a superlative (*yámiṣṭhā*), which makes a fine cadence. Perhaps this morphological parallelism invited the deployment of the double splv. *jyḗṣṭhatamā* in this unfavorable position.

Both Ge and Re predicate the infin. *vāvṛdhádhyai* to a supplied 1st pl. (e.g., "M+V … wollen wir erbauen …"), but there is no reason why the dual dvandva *mitrắváruṇā* can't be a nom., with a passive reading of the infin., as I take it. In Re's case the supposed 1st ps. subj. leads him to take *vaḥ* as obj. ("vous les plus puissants …"), though of course it is plural and does not match the referents in number and, compounding the grammatical lapses, to tr. *mitrắváruṇā* as voc. ("ô Varuṇa-Mitra"). This was not Re's finest hour. Ge manages to shift *vaḥ* off into an oblique role ("für euch," presumably referring to the human beneficiaries of the 1st ps. poet-ritualists' activities), but absent a 1st ps. subj., *vaḥ* can be

attached directly to the poets' songs used for strengthening, as in the publ. tr.

In c the grammatical identity of *raśmā́* (in sandhi with the simile particle *raśméva*) is unclear. It is generally taken, I think correctly, to the *-n*-stem *raśmán-*, otherwise found only in cmpds. Gr calls it an instr., and Wackernagel concurs (AiG III.268), as does Re (clearer in the comm. [EVP VII] than in the weasely tr. "comme (avec) une rene" [EVP V]). But *-mā́* instr. to *-man*-stems are rare; AiG cites only the likewise hapax *drā́ghmā* in X.70.4. We might rather expect **raś(a)nā́* or the like (cf. *mahinā́* to *mahimán-*), and in fact such a posited form might yield the well-attested *-ā́*-stem *raśanā́-* 'halter' as a decasuative from the instr. (though the Iranian forms showing this same internal vowel [see EWA s.v.] might give us pause). Ge by contrast takes it as a nom. sg., which is grammatically impeccable as long as the stem is masc. (Since its other two occurences are in bahuvrīhis, it is impossible to be sure, but suffix-accented *-mán*-stems are in fact generally masc.; cf. AiG II.2.754.) Either nom. or instr. would work fine in the passage; in the former case the comparison would be to Mitra and Varuṇa as controllers; in the latter to the arms with which they perform the controlling (*bāhúbhiḥ svaíḥ*). In neither case would *raśmā́* match the frame in number. I have followed Ge in taking it as a nom., though I would like it to be dual, like *apásā* in 3c, but this is morphologically impossible.

VI.67.2: The first hemistich displays a sort of contrastive ritual synaesthesia. In the first pāda an inspired thought (*manīṣā́*) is 'spread forth' (*prá stṛṇīte*), an action not literally applicable to a verbal product but suitable to the barhis or ritual grass found in b, which is *not* the obj. of this verb. What is going on in b is not clear until we reach the next vs. The b pāda of 2 contains a set of apparently unconnected notions without a unifying verb: *úpa priyā́ námasā barhír ácha* "up to, the two dear ones (or, with a dear one), with homage, to the ritual grass," but the corresponding pāda in 3 pulls together this disarray: *úpa priyā́ námasā hūyámānā*. The missing verbal action is 'call', and now the two dear ones, the instrumental homage, and the barhis all make sense. I therefore (with Ge, but not Re) supply a form of 'call' in 2b. And 'call' is more appropriate to the inspired thought of pāda a than the spreading that occurred there. In the publ. tr. I supply a participial form modifying the inspired thought and having active semantics, with *priyā́* as acc. obj. ("calling [you] two dear ones"). I now see that it might be desirable to supply the exact form found in the next vs., the dual pass. *hūyámānā*, tr. "… you two, the dear ones being called …" However, there is a grammatical obstacle, in that *vām* in 2a must be a gen./dat. enclitic, not an acc., and therefore there is no available acc. in the structural frame of the hemistich that a passive participle could modify. This might be finessed by taking b as a sort of loosely connected new start. However, I prefer to stay with the publ. tr., both for the syntactic reasons just mentioned, and because it makes the connection between the inspired thought and the call to the gods more direct.

The nominal rel. cl. *yád vāṃ varūthyàm* is another ex. of an izafe-like construction. Here, since nothing follows it but a voc., it does not appear embedded, as many such phrases do, but it adds to the dossier of these constructions.

VI.67.3: For the connection of the first hemistich, and esp. b, with 2ab, esp. b, see comm. on the preceding vs. Here, since Mitra and Varuṇa are subjects, the pass. participle *hūyámānā*

is in the nom.

The 2nd hemistich is extremely problematic. Among other things, the rel. prn. *yaú* in c calls for an accented verb, but the only finite verb in the hemistich is unaccented *yatathaḥ* in d; the hapax *apnastháḥ* in c is of unclear meaning and has an uncertain grammatical identity; the following simile *apáseva* has been variously interpr.; *śrudhīyatáḥ* is a hapax denominative part.; and even if all these questions are solved, what does it all add up to?

Before addressing any of these questions directly, note several plays on the syllable *yằ* in the early part of the hymn: 1) PREV + dual rel. pronoun in the initial sequences *sáṃ yā* (1c), *sáṃ yằv* (our 3c) (as well as *prá yằ* [4c] and, with slight transformation, *pári yád* [5c]); 2) dual verbs *yamátuḥ* (1c), *yantám* (2c), *ằ yātam* (3a), *yatathaḥ* (3d). These observations set the stage for a way to reason through the problems of this hemistich.

Let us begin with the problem of the lack of accented verb in what must be a rel. cl. introduced by *sáṃ yaú*. Assuming that d, with its unaccented verb, is the main cl. corresponding to the rel. cl. of c, which has no overt verb, there is a non-arbitrary way to generate one: in 1c the same opening sequence *sáṃ yā* (differing only in the form of the dual rel. prn., attributable to the variation in the following initial) does have an accented verb, pf. *yamátuḥ*, reinforced by the immediately flg. splv. *yámiṣṭhā*, with the verb of 2c, *yantám*, also belonging to the root √*yam*. Our opening *sáṃ yaú* cries out for (or at least whispers for) a similar form of √*yam*, and so I have supplied it. Note that the obj. of *sám … yamátuḥ* in 1cd is *jánān* as here. (Ge [n. 3cd] supplies *náyathaḥ*, on the basis of V.65.6 *yuvám mitremáṃ jánaṃ, yátathaḥ sáṃ ca nayathaḥ*, also a M+V passage; this is a reasonable idea based on a good parallel, and in some ways amounts to the same thing: he tr. "die die Menschen zusammen(halten)" -- but I prefer mine because it is generated within the hymn's context. Old appears to supply a form of √*yat* matching the one in the main cl. of d, as does Re.)

On the question of *apáseva* there is now a reasonable consensus (Old, Ge, Re, and me, but see Gr and Old for alternative views) that this represents a dual NA *apásā* referring to M+V as subjects. They are therefore controlling the peoples (*jánān*) as workers (or, perhaps better, work-overseers) do. But we must now confront the hapax *apnastháḥ*. This is likely a cmpd of *ápnas-* 'property, riches' and a form of √*sthā*. But what form? Gr, Debrunner (AiG II.2.37), and EWA (s.v. *ápnas-*) assign it to a them. stem *apnasthá-*, which would require it to be a nom. sg., which ill accords with the assumed dual subj. If it is nom. sg., then *apásā* would be pushed into the acc. slot, where there is no syntactic place for it, or else, with an unenthusiastic suggestion of Old's, it would be an instr. sg. to the neut. *s*-stem, for **ápasā*. Better to take it, by Old's preferred interpr., as belonging to a root-noun cmpd *apnas-sthằ-*. Under this interpr. it would be an acc. pl. This seems the least objectionable from a contextual point of view; even though acc. pl. to root nouns in *-ā* aren't certainly attested (see the not very helpful treatments of Lanman [Noun Inflec. 451 and passim, Macdonell VG 253), both *-as* and *-ās* seem to be possibilities. The 1st members of cmpds in *-sthằ-* generally have a locatival relationship to their 2nd member, so 'standing/staying in *ápnas-*' is the likely meaning. As for its function in the clause, I take it as qualifying *jánān* (so also Old, though with alternatives), while Ge and Re take it as part of the simile (e.g., "... die die Menschen zusammen(halten) wie Werkmeister die Lohnarbeiter"), and Scar, flg. Neisser, takes it as the designation of a group of people distinct from the general *jánān* but still in the frame. In the absence of other attestations of the cmpd or underlying phrase, this cannot be

decisively determined. For a detailed disc. of the word and the passage, see Scar 645–46.

The denom. *śrudhīyá-* is, by most accounts (see Old, Re), but not by Ge's (see n. 3d), built to the 2nd sg. impv. *śrudhí* 'listen!'. It is an acc. pl. part. The question is what sense it is conveying. Gr glosses 'gehorsam sein', but since *even* (*cid*) this group of people is put in its place by M+V with their greatness (*mahitvā́*), it is unlikely that they were already obedient. Old (see also Re) suggests that it is people who address M+V with this impv., perhaps indicating that they stand in a close or privileged relationship with those gods. I think rather that it may refer to people powerful enough to command obedience from other men through such peremptory commands. They would then be similar in stature to the *apnastháḥ*: two sets of people used to getting their own way (rich and demanding), who have to submit to M+V.

VI.67.4: The birth of M+V from Aditi. This vs. is also beset with difficulties. The major structural one is determining the interrelationships of the three subordinate clauses, in abc, marked by *yā́, yád*, and *yā́* respectively, and their joint relationship (or not) to the main clause in d. Once again, there are numerous competing views; I will not rehearse them all. In my view, the three subordinate clauses are not all parallel and semi-independent, but rather the two introduced by the dual rel. prn. *yā́* (a, c) are parallel and jointly dependent on the middle cl. introduced by *yád* (b). In tr. I have flipped the order of a and b in hopes of making the sense a bit more parsable. I further think that the two forms of *yā́* 'which two' have as antecedent in b the sg. *gárbham*: "the embryo which was those two" or "the two as embryo." M+V formed one of the pairs that Aditi gave birth to serially and in that sense were a single *gárbham*.

Let us then concentrate first on pāda a. Here, as in 1ab, there is an infin. in *-dhyai* predicated of a god's name, *áditiḥ*: "When Aditi (was) to bear." The puzzle in the vs. is *ṛtā́*, and numerous analyses have been proposed: nom. sg. fem. to normally neut. *ṛtá-* 'truth (etc.)'; short instr. sg. to the same stem; dual to the same stem; a 3rd sg. denom. verb to the same stem (emending to **ṛtāyád* from *ṛtā́ yád*), or, the solution I favor, as a short loc. sg. to *ṛtú-* 'season' (so Ge, though see his n. 4b), even though *-u*-stems supposedly have only *-au/-avi* locc. (but see Lanman p. 411: "if there is any certain instance of a L in *-â*, it must be regarded as due to false analogy." I see no problem with analogy, false or otherwise).

The two *yā́* clauses are nominal. The first (a) presents no problems. In the 2nd (c) most tr. supply a verb with *prá*, e.g., Ge "die sich gross hervortun" (sim. Re). However, I take *jā́yamānā* as a predicated pres. part. and *máhi* as an intensifier of *mahā́ntā*.

In d the sense of the verb *ní dīdhaḥ* is unclear, and the lexeme *ní √ dhṛ* is not common. Gr glosses this passage as 'machen' with double acc.; Ge tr. 'hatte … getragen', Re 'avait placé en secret'. In the three other passages containing *ní (ā́) √ dhṛ* that I know of (IV.2.12, VI.17.6, *ní-ā́* VIII.17.13), the idiom means something like 'fix' or 'secure', but here I think it applies to the process of birth: 'bear down'. Although I know of no other such exx., this kind of technical birth context doesn't come up very often in the RV. The birth process interpr. fits well with the predicated pres. part. of c: "who *were being* born" as well as with the indication in b that Aditi had reached her precise time for giving birth.

VI.67.5: This vs. is refreshingly straightforward, even though the main cl. of d seems

something of an irrelevancy after the grand statements in abc.

VI.67.6: The vs. is knit together with phonological and etymological figures. Each pāda contains a form of *div/dyu*: a *dyū́n*, b *dyóḥ*, c *-devo*, d *dyā́m*. Note also the phonological similarity of the two du. verbs *dhāráyethe* (a), *dṛṃhéthe* (b), with the latter reprised etymologically by *dṛḷhó* in c. Pādas b and d also rhyme.

    Unlike the standard tr. I take b as part of the *hí* cl. beginning in a, with cd as the main cl. Since the verb of b, *dṛṃhéthe*, is initial, it can owe its accent either to its position (as most interpr. it) or to belonging to a subord. cl., as I do. Nonetheless, there is little riding on this choice, though I would support mine by pointing out that the fact that M+V made the back of heaven firm (b) could serve as a reason why the sun is also firmly fixed (c).

    Contra Klein (explicitly, DGRV I.379–80) and Ge/Re (implicitly), I do not think that *utá*, positioned in the middle of c, conjoins b and c, but instead begins a new cl., which continues through d.

    With Ge (and, judging from his tr., Re), I divide *dhāsínāyóḥ* into *dhāsínā ayóḥ*, with the gen.-loc. du. of *ayám*, not *āyóḥ*, gen.-abl. sg. of *āyú-* with the Pp.

VI.67.7: Ge follows Sāy. in interpr. this vs. as referring to rain and river waters. Although this would accord better with the enigmatic gush (*dhāsí-*) of 6d, it doesn't fit the vocabulary or apparent sense of this enigmatic vs. The best clue we have is pāda a, where "to fill the belly" (*jathāram pṛṇádhyai*) belongs to a phrase for drinking soma to satiation (cf. nearby VI.69.7 and V.34.2, X.104.2, as well as other locutions involving soma and the belly). (Both Old and Re also take the pāda as referring to soma.) Once the poet has established the soma context with this reasonably clear phraseology, he can (and does) treat the subject in a more obscure fashion.

    In b and c I take the feminine plurals *sábhṛtayaḥ* 'of the same rearing / pedigree' and *yuvatáyò 'vātāḥ* 'unsurpassable maidens' as referring to the fingers (of the priests) that press the soma. Such locutions, referring to the shared kinship of the fingers (because they belong to the same hand), are frequent in the IXth Maṇḍala and the forms are always feminine. I am tolerably certain of the second identification, since the action ascribed to them in pāda d, distributing their "milk," would be a reasonable way (given the tropes of soma preparation) to characterize the work of the pressing fingers. I am less certain about the identification in b, because "fill the seat" (*sádma … pṛṇánti*) is not as easy to connect with soma preparation. "Seat" could refer, inter alia, to the ritual ground or the cosmos -- both are attested -- but neither is generally flooded with soma. *sábhṛti-* is a hapax, so it does not help identify the referent. So the sense of pāda b remains in doubt for me.

    Note another ex. of a *-dhyai* infinitive, though this time not as the predicated substitute for a main verb.

VI.67.8: Pāda a lacks a verb; on its structure and on the grammatical interpr. of *sumedhā́(ḥ)*, see esp. Old. Since it is likely that *sumedhā́(ḥ)* is a nom. sg., referring to Agni, this slots the du. *tā́* into the acc., and we need a verb to link the two. Though Old's 'lead' is possible, I follow Ge(/Re) in supplying 'call', since this connects this ritual vs. with those in the earlier parts of the hymn (2ab, 3ab; see publ. intro. and comm. ad locc.). As is generally

recognized, the referent of the nom. is Agni; III.57.5, adduced by Old, makes this quite clear: *yã te jihvã madhumatī sumedhã, ágne …*

The word *aratí-* 'spoked wheel' in b is another word regularly applied to Agni. This pāda also contains, by most interpr., two words associated with truth, *satyá-*, modifying *aratí-*, and *ṛtá-*, but these interpr. are hard-pressed to come up with a convincing interpr. of the loc. *ṛté*. By contrast, I interpr. it as I do the similarly structured II.29.4 *mã vo ráthaḥ … ṛté bhūt*, where, with Re, I take *ṛté* as the postposition 'without', construed with a pronominal enclitic in 2nd position: "Let (our) chariot not come to be without you." See comm. ad loc. In the passage here I assume that the absence of M+V at the ritual ground induces Agni to call them with his tongue (=crackling). This interpr. also fits with the rivalry vss. to follow (9–11): if M+V are not here, where are they? Probably at the sacrifice of a competitor.

On *(vi) cayiṣṭam* see Hoffmann, Aufs. II.367.

VI.67.9–11: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss. seem to concern themselves with rival sacrificers.

VI.67.9: The first half of this vs. is fairly straightforward; the problems arise in the 2nd hemistich, primarily because of *áp^i yaḥ* in d. The first hemistich describes the behavior of the contentious and impious rivals, while the 2nd defines such people as outside the normal categories of beings. Pāda c asserts clearly that those who don't attend upon the sacrifice are neither gods nor men, and in d they are compared instead to *áp^i yaḥ … putrāḥ*, which is universally tr. as "like the sons of the watery female" (e.g., Ge "wie die Söhne der Wasserfrau"). Not only does this make no obvious (or unobvious) sense, but the morphology is essentially impossible: it is very difficult to get *áp^i yaḥ* to be either the gen. sg. of a fem. *-ī*-stem or the nom. pl. m. of an adj. See the rather despairing assessments of Ge (n. 9d), Debrunner (AiG II.2.401), and esp. Scar (592 n. 841). Desperate situations require desperate measures, and I therefore part company with the consensus interpr. of *áp^i yaḥ* and suggest an entirely different derivation -- as a negated root noun cmpd to the seṭ form of the 'swell' root √*pī*. We should expect a root-accented **a-pî-*, with nom. pl. **apíyaḥ*, but I would suggest that this unclear hapax would have been attracted to the reasonably well-attested 'watery' stem *áp^i ya-* and the accent retracted. As for meaning, I suggest that 'not swelling/swollen' means 'not growing / thriving', and in reference to children to stunted or underdeveloped ones, afflicted by what is now called "failure to thrive" in pediatric medicine. Note that the aniṭ form of the 'swell' root makes a negated root-noun cmpd *apít-* in VII.82.3 *ápinvatam apítaḥ* "you two made the unswollen (waters) swell."

The publ. tr. does not represent the rel. prn. *yé* in c but treats all of cd as the main cl. corresponding to the subord. clauses of ab. I do not know an easy way to do this, but might suggest an alternative tr. of cd as "those not attending on the sacrifice who are neither gods … nor mortals are like children …"

VI.67.10: Ge and Re take the first hemistich here as a continuation of the description of bad ritual behavior, with cd introducing our contrastively correct practice. I think rather that the

whole of 10 describes this good behavior. One advantage of this interpr. is that it allows *ắd* opening c to have its normal sense 'after that', which Klein (DGRV II.135–36) must explicitly deny it. By my interpr. the first pāda sets the ritual scene, with the various priestly speakers 'distributing' the types of ritual speech, as is standard in Vedic ritual. Some of these speakers recite the Nivids, the formal invocations. After this "we" take over by speaking *ukthá-*.

On *kīstá-* 'praiser' see comm. ad I.127.7. I see no evidence for Re's 'mauvais-prêtres' beyond his contextual assumptions.

The interpr. of ab as referring to bad practice turns on the part. *manānắḥ*, which most take as meaning '(falsely) considering X as Y' (e.g., Ge "was sie für Einladungssprüche halten"), but no evidence is presented that this should be the meaning of this root aor. part., the only occurrence of the participial stem. Most other forms of this medial root aor. (mostly attested in the subjunctive) have a positive sense: 'bring to mind', 'conceive', 'ponder', etc. The publ. tr. has 'pay heed to', but any of the other suggested tr. just given would work as well, while '(falsely) consider' has no support in this stem.

Pāda d is syntactically problematic. The last two words (*yatatho mahitvắ*) are identical to the ending of 3d and appear to sketch a ring and a return to the focus on M+V's ability to put human beings in order. Because of this salient repetition, I am reluctant to ascribe an entire different sense to this phrase in this vs. than in 3, as both Ge and Re do, with both also unacceptably stretching the meaning of the verb form. In order to take d as a single cl., they must also treat *nákiḥ* as a simple neg. rather than in its usual meaning 'no one', since the verb *yatathaḥ* is 2nd du. and cannot take 'no one' as subject. In order to avoid this problem, I create problems of my own. I take *nákiḥ* as a radically truncated sentence "No one …" This is based on the observation that one of the most common contexts in which *nákis* appears is as subj. of *minat* (etc.) 'violate(s)' (cf., e.g., I.69.7, IV.30.23, VI.30.2, etc.). I therefore suggest that *nákiḥ* here is an implicit response to the description of the behavior of bad rivals in 9b *priyắ dhắma yuvádhitā minánti* "they violate the dear ordinances ordained by you". Here in *our* ritual "no one" performs such violation. With *nákis* out of the way, the rest of the pāda can be harmonized with the use of *yatatho mahitvắ* in 3d. There M+V 'set in place' various peoples (*jánān*). Here I would re-supply *jánān* and take *devébhiḥ* as an instr. of accompaniment: M+V set in place the peoples along with the gods. I would prefer not to have to impose such a radical analysis on this pāda, but I find other analyses even more unsatisfactory.

VI.67.11: The first hemistich lacks a verb, but something like 'we seek' is a reasonable bet, to govern *áskṛdhoyu* 'not stunted', which elsewhere modifies 'wealth' (VI.22.3) and 'treasure-conferral' (VII.53.3), hence my 'giving'.

Ge produces an elaborate interpr. of cd as a portrayal of battle: 'cows' = bow string, 'straight-flying one' = arrow. Although such tropes would be at home in other parts of the RV, I see no martial context in this hymn that would encourage such a reading. Better to interpr. the hemistich within a ritual context, since this has been prominent in the hymn. The cows can, as so often, be the milk meant to be mixed with the soma; the 'straight-flying one' (*ṛjipyá-*, on which see comm. ad IV.27.4) can be the soma, or, as in IV.27.4, the falcon that carried the soma, and the bull in d is also the soma. Re follows Ge's battle interpr., though

(in his comm.) he also sees it overlaid with soma imagery.

VI.68 Indra and Varuṇa
    Pace Old, I do not think this consists of two (much less three) hymns, with 1–8 forming one, 9–11, or 9, 10–11, one or two more. As indicated in the publ. intro., the last three vss. focus on the ritual here-and-now, but this topic-switch from praise and request to ritual exhortation is easily accommodated within the same hymn. That 9–10 are in Jagatī in contrast to the Triṣṭubh in the rest of the hymn is not sufficient to signal a hymn break, esp. since 9–10 doesn't match either of Old's suggested groupings.

VI.68.1: The opening of this hymn has some features in common with the opening of the last one (VI.67.1), and of course both hymns are dedicated to dual divinities, with Varuṇa shared. The 1ˢᵗ hemistich of each ends with a *-dhyai* infinitive; the 1ˢᵗ pāda has a 2ⁿᵈ ps. enclitic in 2ⁿᵈ position (*vaḥ, vām* respectively), and the 2ⁿᵈ hemistich begins PREV *yá-* (*yā̆, yáḥ* respectively). However the hymns unfold very differently.
    Ge takes *sajóṣā(ḥ)* at the end of pāda a as an "erstarrter Kasus oder Hypallage" (n. 1a) referring to I+V. But grammatically it should modify *yajñáḥ*, and there is no semantic obstacle to taking it thus. Re agrees, and further remarks that, since *sajóṣas-* regularly takes an instr., it is tempting to construe it with *śruṣṭī́* — a temptation he resists and I have succombed to.
    I take the gen./abl. *vṛktábarhiṣaḥ* as the oblique subject of the inf. *yájadhyai*, rather than predicating that inf. to cognate *yajñáḥ* —though the latter construction (reflected in Ge and Re, insofar as I can untangle their clotted syntax) is not impossible: "This sacrifice of the one who has twisted the ritual grass, raised up, is to be sacrificed to you …"

VI.68.2: Although the vs. is addressed to both gods, Indraic qualities predominate: *śáviṣṭha-* almost always qualifies Indra, who is regularly called a *śū́ra-*; *maghávan-* is of course a standing epithet of his, and the splv. *máṃhiṣṭha-* frequently modifies him; both *tuviśúṣma-* (3x) and *sárvasena-* (3x) are otherwise only used of Indra; and *vṛtratúr-* encapsulates Indra's signature deed. Only *ṛténā* falls in Varuṇa's domain.
    I do not understand the position of *tā́ hí*, though 1) *hí* sometimes takes immediate pre-verbal position even deep in the clause, and 2) the heavy NP *śū́rāṇāṃ śáviṣṭhā* (with the first word having quadrisyllabic scansion) would not fit metrically in a putative pāda #*tā́ hí śū́rāṇāṃ śáviṣṭhā bhūtam*.

VI.68.3: This is the only vs. in the hymn that clearly disjoins the two gods and describes each by his own qualities (though see comm. ad 8–9) -- though as Re points out, the description of Varuṇa in d is somewhat obscure. I take it to refer to Varuṇa's ritual activity, as against Indra's warrior exploits.
    Although *śúṣma-* (2c) and *śūṣá-* (3a) are not etymologically related, their phonological similarity associates them, and they are positioned identically in these two vss. See also the *śū́rāṇāṃ śáviṣṭhā* figure in 2b and *śávasā* in 3c: there is an abundance of *śu/ū / śav* forms.
    On the constr. of *cakānā́* see Kü (142–43 and n. 132), who rejects Ge's passive interpr.

VI.68.4: As noted in the publ. intro., it is quite rare to present the collectivity of gods as subdivided into female and male divinities. I'm not sure why this context has evoked it.

As Re notes in passing, the 1st hemistich contains two forms of *nṛ́-* 'man' in different usage. The first (*nárah*) is contrasted with *gnā́ḥ*, as male to female, and identifies these *nárah* as gods; the 2nd (*narā́m*) appears to refer to the mortal poets as superior men and agents of the praise of the gods. For this putative gen. agent, compare the similar constr. with the same ppl. at I.122.10 *narā́m gūrtáśravaḥ* "whose fame is sung by men" (and cf. also I.180.8 *narā́m ... práśastaḥ*).

In 2 of its 4 occurrences *svágūrta-* modifies rivers and can reasonably be rendered 'self-praised' because rivers generate their own noise (gurgling), which can be conceptually configured as praise. But in our passage it seems unlikely that the gods are praising themselves (*pace* Ge). In IV.19.10 the adj. modifies *ápāṃsi*, Indra's 'labors', and there I tr. "welcomed for themselves', since labors don't have the capacity to praise themselves. I suggest the word in this passage has a similar sense, even though, as animate beings, gods *could* praise themselves. But I think the point is that, though the All Gods are going to take second place after I+V in pāda c, the poet acknowledges that they deserve some praise of their own. -*gūrta-* picks up etymologically related *gṛṇīhi* 'sing!' in 3a, with *gṛṇānā́* (8a), *gṛṇántaḥ* (8c) continuing the lexical chain.

Pāda d contains a reverse Vāyav Indraś ca construction, *dyaúś ca pṛthivi*. The introduction and invocation of Heaven and Earth seems a little odd in a hymn celebrating Indra and Varuṇa, and the sense of the pāda is somewhat unclear. See Old's disc. The pāda seems to indicate that Heaven and Earth stand out from the other All Gods just as much as Indra and Varuṇa do, an elevation of gods other than the addressees of the hymn that deviates from standardb2ZZ RVic practice. The structure of the hemistich, with instr. *mahitvā́* ending c and expressing the quality by which I+V are preeminent, invites us to take pāda-final *urvī́* as a similar instr. of an abstract 'width, breadth', rather than the usual fem. du. NA. This would yield "you stand out from them by your greatness, o Indra and Varuṇa, (as) do you two, o Heaven and Earth, by your breadth." Although such an abstract *urvī́-* does not otherwise exist, I am still tempted to assume that this was the intent of the passage: giving a well-known measure of superiority (the width of H+E) as a standard by which to judge that of I+V.

VI.68.5: Several minor sound plays in the vs.: *dā́śati* (b) / *dāsvān* (c); **iṣā́ sá dviṣā́s**.

VI.68.6: The publ. tr. failed to render *devā́*; insert "O gods" at the beg. of the vs.

VI.68.7: It is difficult to render the comparative of *sutrātará-* without awkwardness, and so I have not attemped to do so.

Note the etymological and phonological figure *tiráte táturiḥ*. The cadence is bad, and it would be better to read **tatūriḥ*. Of the 5 occurrences of this stem, this reading would be preferable also in IV.39.2 and probably VI.24.2, but dispreferred in I.145.3 and VI.22.2. The 4 occurrences of the similarly formed *pápuri-* are always metrically better with a light root syllable.

VI.68.8: Ge (n. 8c) claims that this pāda applies only to Indra, but this is not entirely evident to me. It is true that VI.33.5c, adduced by Ge, is almost identical (*itthā gṛṇánto mahínasya śárman*) and refers to Indra, and it is also true that *śárdhas-* 'force' regularly refers to the Marut troop, Indra's regular associates, and could (but need not) here. However, the context still does not seem to me sufficiently diagnostic.

VI.68.9–11: On the annunciatory forms of *ayám* in these three vss., see publ. intro.

VI.68.9: Ge also (n. 8c) claims (fld. by Re) that this vs. is entirely Varuṇa's. This is more plausible: he is mentioned by name in b, and *máhivrataḥ* 'having great commandments'in c makes it likely that the clause in cd has Varuṇa as subject —though note that *máhivrata-* is used of Varuṇa only here, with two occurrences each of Agni and Soma, and moreover *dhṛtavratā* is addressed to both gods in the next vs. (10b). Nonetheless, *samrāj-* in pāda a is used frequently of Indra as well as of Varuṇa, so the 1st hemistich may (and probably does) contain a exhortation to the poet to chant both to Indra (as sovereign king) and Varuṇa. The publ. tr. could make this clearer if 'and' replaced the comma: "to the lofty sovereign king (and) to the god Varuṇa"

VI.68.11: The 2nd pāda has a rather but insistent elementary phonetic/etymological figure: *vṛṣṇaḥ … vṛṣaṇā vṛṣethām*, and the last word of the vs. *mādayethām* resonates with the long adj. qualifying soma in the 1st pāda, *mádhumattamasya*.

VI.69 Indra and Viṣṇu

  Re's treatment is in EVP XV.43–46. He claims that the "thème indraïque" dominates, though I find the hymn's phraseology so bland that it's difficult to assign qualities and deeds to one or the other, and in fact the most salient action in the hymn, the wide-striding of vs. 5, is Viṣṇu's characteristic deed. See further in the publ. intro.

  The hymn is (in my view) repetitive and pedestrian, with only a few striking images and phraseological tricks. This strikes me as an indication that the poet was "phoning it in" -- the composition of the hymn does not seem to have commanded his full attention. The question might then arise why the hymn was preserved in the Saṃhitā. This might be partially due to the rarity of Indra-Viṣṇu hymns (only the first three vss. of I.155 and the middle three vss. of VII.99 -- so this is the only hymn entirely dedicated to both) and in fact of Viṣṇu hymns in general. As Viṣṇu, a fairly recessive god in the RV, began to come to prominence in the post-RVic period, the assemblers of the RV collection may have gathered what scraps they could and exercised less critical judgment than usual in order to create a place in the text for this newly important deity. The O'Henry-type ending, sprung by the final vs. (8), might also account for its preservation.

VI.69.1: Acdg. to Re, *kárman-* is esp. associated with Indra, *íṣ-* with Viṣṇu, but I see no clear evidence of this.

  pārá- 'far shore' and *pāráya-* 'cause to cross [to the far shore]' are of course etymologically related, and here they express allied notions: just as we cause Indra and Viṣṇu to reach the 'far shore' of their labor, so do they cause us to cross something

unspecified, but quite possibly the reference is to completing the ritual.

VI.69.2: It is striking -- and perhaps a little insulting -- to refer to the gods Indra and Viṣṇu as soma-holding tubs, though of course once they have drunk the soma, that is what, in effect, they are. This image recurs in 6d.

The two heavy pres. passive participles *śasyámānāḥ* and *gīyámānāsaḥ* seem meant to convey that the sacrifice is currently ongoing, hence my "as they are being …"

In d *arkaíḥ* is taken by Ge and Re as referring to the chants of the sacrifice, and in the context of recitation and singing this sense is clearly the principal one. Both Ge and Re interpr. the instr. as meaning "in the form of," and I have followed them in the publ. tr. -- though an instr. of accompaniment "along with chants" would also be possible. I further think the word is a pun, with the secondary sense "along with the rays (of the sun)" as often (e.g., VI.4.6). This would be a temporal designation of dawn, when the sacrifice is taking place. That the next vs. contains a similar pun (in my view) supports such an interpr. here.

VI.69.3: *dráviṇo dádhānā* in b is essentially the same VP as *dráviṇam … dhattam* in 1c. I do not know why the *s*-stem *drávinas-* was substituted for the thematic *dráviṇa-*, esp. as the acc. of the latter, *dráviṇam*, would fit the meter just as well. The first VP, *dráviṇaṃ dhattam*, reappears in 6c.

There are other echoes of previous vss.: 3cd *sáṃ vām … sám* repeats 1a, and *matīnām* in c both repeats the same word in the same metrical position in 2a and anticipates it in 4c.

The 2nd half of this vs. is structured like that of vs. 2, esp. pāda d, where both 2d and 3d have the form PREV *stómāsaḥ* PRES.PASS.PART. INSTR.('song')-*aiḥ*. The instr. could, as in the previous vs., express accompaniment.

As in 2, I see a pun here: because of the etym. figure *añjantv aktúbhiḥ* "let them anoint with ointments," the principal sense of *aktú-* must be 'ointment', here metaphorical for the "ointments of thoughts." But instr. *aktúbhiḥ* often means 'through the nights', as in the phrase *dyúbhir aktúbhiḥ* "through the days and the nights" (e.g., I.112.25), and I see this temporal sense here as well.

VI.69.4: As just noted, *matīnām* occurs here for the 3rd time, while *juṣéthām* is repeated from 1c.

VI.69.5: As noted in the publ. intro., both gods are credited with wide striding (b), although this is normally only Viṣṇu's act. The cosmogonic opening out of the spaces in the more vaguely phrased 2nd hemistich can be applied to Indra, however.

VI.69.6: The image of the gods as soma-holding tubs returns here in d, but this time it is mediated through the image of them as the sea (*samudráḥ*) and therefore couched in the singular.

The d pāda is a repetition of 4d, save for the substitution of *hávam* for *gíraḥ*. Such verbatim repetition of a full pāda within a hymn is very rare (save for refrains) and relatively rare even between two hymn -- again, in my view, an indication that the poet was not feeling particularly inspired.

VI.69.7: In ab Ge honors the pāda break and construes *sómasya* with *jaṭháram pṛṇethām*. But we might expect an instr. *sómena* in that case (as in V.34.2), and the enjambment envisioned here is very mild.

VI.69.8: On the surprise ending here and the splitting up of what was throughout the rest of the hymn an indissoluble pair, see publ. intro. The first pāda keeps the two as a pair, with dual verbs *jigyathuḥ* and *jayethe* asserting that both won and both did not lose the contest. The audience would first take this as meaning they did not lose to their (joint) opponent. But in b we have the first splitting of the pair into two (implied) singulars (*ná … katarás canaínoḥ* "neither one of these two"), which could raise the possibility that they were contending with each other -- but paradoxically neither one lost. Their mutual contention is then made explicit in pāda c, with, inter alia, a reverse Vāyav Indraś ca construction (*índraś ca viṣṇo*) serving as the subj. of a dual verb (*ápasṛdhethām*), which in the middle voice refers to *mutual* conflict, and the final pāda explains (or implies) how in such a situation neither one lost: the 1000 (cows) were split into three parts, and as later Vedic texts indicate, Indra got two-thirds and Viṣṇu one-third. It may be that the reversal of the Vāyav Indraś ca construction, which puts *índraḥ* in first position, also signals his relative, but not complete, dominance in this story.

VI.70 Heaven and Earth
  Re XVP.121ff.

VI.70.1–2: As noted in the publ. intro., the focus here is on the various liquids associated with Heaven and Earth and their sheer moisture. Vs. 1 has ghee, honey, milk (by implication, in the compd. *madhu-dúghe*), and semen; in vs. 2 they are said never to dry up (*ásaścantī*) and possess streams, milk, ghee, and semen. The cmpd. *madhu-dúh-* 'milking out honey' in 1b is reprised by the VP *ghṛtáṃ duhāte* in 2b (with a diff. obj.). Another responsion is *bhúvanānām* 'creatures' (1a) and (*asyá*) *bhúvanasya* '(this) creation' in 2c.

VI.70.1: *pṛthvī́* here (and in the same phrase in 4c) is of course a blindingly obvious pun: though used as an adj. here ('broad') it is of course (almost) identical to the standard word for 'earth', found in the dual dvandva *dyā́vā-pṛthivī́* in the next pāda (also 4a, 5a). By an accident of grammar, the nom./acc. dual fem. (in *pṛthvī́*, here modifying the dual dvandva) and the nom. singular. fem. *pṛthivī́* 'earth' have the same ending *-ī́*. This grammatical pun is only actualized fully in the final vs. of the hymn, where we get the conjoined singular NP *dyaúś ca pṛthivī́ ca*.

VI.70.3: On the double etym. figure *prá prajā́bhir jāyate*, see comm. ad VIII.27.16.
  With Re I take *dhármaṇas pári* with a full lexical sense of each element, rather than, with Ge, as a weakened adverbial "pflichtgemäss" (dutifully). Heaven and Earth provide the physical foundation (*dhárman-*) starting from which the pious man can found his family line, just as Heaven and Earth themselves took their places (apart) according to the *dhárman-* of Varuṇa in 1c.

The abundant references to real liquids in vss. 1–2 find their metaphorical expression in the creatures 'poured out' (*siktā́*) from Heaven and Earth (d). This ppl. picks up the imperative *rétaḥ siñcatam* "pour the semen" addressed to H+E in 2d. However, I take the implicit subj. of *siktā́* to be *bhúvanā* 'creatures' vel sim. (see 1a), not, with Gr, *rétāṃsi* 'semens'. *prajā́ḥ* 'progeny, offspring' from the previous pāda would also be possible; it would only require altering the Pp reading *siktā́* to fem. pl. *siktā́ḥ*, but no alteration to the Saṃhitā text.

My "poured out from you" of course tacitly misrepresents the case of dual *yuvóḥ*, which must be gen.-loc., not abl. But it's worth noting that the 2nd du abl. *yuvát* is attested only once in the RV, and I take *yuvóḥ* as an ex. of the all-purpose genitive: poured out from you and hence yours.

The explictly contrastive *víṣurūpāṇi sávratā* reminds us of the phrase in the Yama/Yamī hymn X.10.2, *sálakṣmā … víṣurūpā*, describing Yamī compared to Yama: "having the same marks, but dissimilar form."

VI.70.4–5: These two vss., concerning ghee and honey respectively, have similarly structured 1st halves: a case form of the substance opens the vs. (4a *ghṛténa*, 5a *mádhu*), while the 2nd pāda consists of three 3 cmpds in the dual with the substance as 1st member. The 2nd members do not repeat (*ghṛta-śríyā ghṛta-pṛ́cā ghṛtā-vṛ́dhā; madhu-ścútā madhu-dúghe mádhu-vrate*), but only the last two are not root noun cmpds.

VI.70.4: The ghee vs., with four instances in the 1st hemistich, echoing in the first word of the hymn *ghṛtávatī*. There is also some recycling and remixing of vocab.: 1a *abhiśríyā* : 4ab *abhī́-vṛte ghṛta-śríyā*, as well as outright repetition: 1b / 4c *urvī́ pṛthvī́*.

The third pāda contains a ritual pun, "set in front at the choosing of the Hotar priest" (*hotṛvū́rye puróhite*): *purohité* here modifies H+E, but ordinarily it is the Hotar priest himself who is "set in front."

VI.70.5: In b *madhudúghe* reprises the same word in the same metrical position in 1b.

What 'having honeyed commandments' refers to is not clear to me; it is a hapax and picks up similarly pāda-final *śúci-vrate* 'of pure commandments' (2b) and *sávratā* 'having the same commandments' (3d).

I configure cd slightly differently from the standard, which takes *yajñáṃ dráviṇaṃ ca* as what H+E establish for the gods and the misc. acc. in d as what they do for us. My interpr. is informed by two passages in the immediately preceding hymn: VI.69.1 *juṣéthāṃ yajñáṃ dráviṇaṃ ca dhattam* "enjoy the sacrifice and confer wealth" and VI.69.6 *dráviṇam dhattam asmé* "confer wealth on us." In both passages *dráviṇam* is implicitly or explicitly meant for us, while in the 1st *yajñám* is meant for the gods to enjoy. This matches the use of *dráviṇa-* elsewhere: it's what mortals want and gods confer on them. I therefore construe *dráviṇam* as the first member of the complex NP to be taken with *asmé* in d (*dráviṇam ca … máhi śrávo vājam … suvī́ryam*. Ge (n. 5c) recognizes the problem but chooses to go with the pāda division. My interpr. has the further advantage of not having to take *devátā* as an honorary dative, but rather with the instr. value that it should have.

VI.70.6: On the grammatical pun that accounts for the disjoining of the dual dvandva *dyā́vā-pṛthivī́*, see comm. ad vs. 1. This disjoining is somewhat reminiscent of the same move in the previous hymn, where the dvandva *índrā-víṣṇū* appears in every vs. except the last, where not only are the two gods separated (*índraś ca viṣṇo*), but contend with each other. There is no contention here, but the grammatical shift is the same.

VI.71 Savitar
    Re EVP XV.26ff. On the division into two hymns, see publ. intro., as well as Old and Ge (both minimally).

VI.71.1: I take the locatival expression *rájaso vídharmaṇi* as expressing a verbal notion "in/at his speading apart …," rather than as marking a location like Ge ("im Zwischenreich des Raumes"). In this I am in general agreement with Re, who calls it a "semi-infinitif," a typical Re evasion, though I am sympathetic to it here.

VI.71.2: The *-mani* form *vídharmaṇi* ending 1d prepares the way for a 2nd such expression, *savitúḥ sávimani*, though with a subjective, not objective gen. The parallelism might be better expressed in tr. by "at the best impelling of …" This locatival (semi-)infinitive is then explicitly conjoined with a datival one: *vásunaś ca dāváne* "for the giving of goods." On the lack of parallelism see Klein DGRV I.94.
    Somewhere between the 1st vs. and the last pāda of vs. 2 Savitar's reference changes from 3rd (clear in the 3rd ps. verbs of which he is subj. in 1b, c *ayaṃsta* and *pruṣṇute*) to 2nd (clear in 2nd sg. *ási* in 2d). This verb makes it clear that the reference in the whole rel. cl. of cd must be 2nd ps., but in the main cl. of ab *devásya … savitúḥ* could be either 3rd or 2nd -- a typical modulation tactic in the RV.
    In both hemistichs the construction of the (semi-)predicated (semi-)infinitives is abrupt. In each case there's a form of the verb 'to be' (*syāma* b, *ási* d) with loc. (and in b dat.) infinitivals. For ease of parsing I have supplied "(there)" and "(busy)" respectively.

VI.71.3: On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

VI.71.4: On the almost identical first pādas of the 1st and 2nd hymns of this composite, see publ. intro. In addition to the exact repetitions of the a-pādas, note that both 1 and 4 have a verbal expression from the *sū* root that gives Savitar his name: 1b *sávanāya* and 4d *suvati*. This vs. also recycles and remixes some of the vocab. from the final vs. of the preceding hymn, 3: 3c *híraṇya-jihvaḥ* gets redistributed into 4b *híraṇya-pāṇiḥ* and 4c *mandrá-jihvaḥ*, and a further X-body part bahuvrīhi, *áyo-hanuḥ*, is added.

VI.71.5: This vs. continues variations on vs. 1. Like 4a it begins *úd u* (or in this case *ū́*). The VP in 1ab *hiraṇyáyā, bāhū́ ayaṃsta* is almost entirely matched by 5ab *áyān … bāhū́, hiraṇyáyā* with exactly reverse order and act. verb rather than middle.
    The publ. tr. follows the attractive suggestion of Re concerning *ábhvam* 'formless', that it refers to the wind. That the wind tends to drop at evening provides some support for this interpr. I would further suggest that the *cid* in the phrase *kác cid ábhvam* is doing double

duty: expressing both '(what)ever' and 'even'.

VI.71.6: In c I accept the emendation of *kṣáyasya* to **kṣáyasi*, which goes back to Aufrecht (see Old, Ge, Re, all of whom accept it; against this tide is Scar 353–54, though he doesn't even note the general view). Inter alia, it provides an accented verb for the *hí* in pāda c; *syāma* in d is unaccented and should therefore not be construed with the previous pāda.

VI.72 Indra and Soma
Re's brief comments are found in EVP XVI.108–9. His assessment -- "banal" -- is spot on. For the structure of the hymn, see publ. intro.

VI.72.1: The pleonastic *máhi … mahitvám* "great greatness" may be in service of phonological play: *máhi tád vām* is echoed in abbreviated form by immediately following *mahitvám*.

The (near?) synonyms *sū́ryam* and *svàr* are found as the obj. of the same verb *vividáthuḥ* in c. I have followed Lü (191) in tr. the first as 'sun' and the 2nd as 'sunlight' ("Sonne … Sonnenlicht"), which is almost the same as Ge's "Sonne … Himmelslicht," but preserves the lexical similarity better. Re prefers 'ciel'. The verb is accented because it stands between its two predicates and thus implicitly serves two clauses.

VI.72.2: Here the verb in a, *vāsáyathaḥ*, is accented because it follows the extrasentential voc. *índrāsomā* and therefore effectively begins the vs.

The first hemistich describes dawn and the sunrise in the pres. tense as repeated daily events. The 2nd hemistich by contrast recounts the original separation of Heaven and Earth. The 2nd verb in this hemistich, the augmented impf. *áprathatam* (d), clearly locates the action in the past. The previous verb, *skambháthuḥ* (c), is formally anomalous. It is generally identified as a non-reduplicated pf. (so explicitly Gr; listed with the pf. by Whitney [Roots], Macdonell [VGS]; by implication Re) because of its clear 3rd du. pf. ending. But in addition to its lack of redupl., its full-gr. root syllable is unexpected. Kü treats the form in some detail (574), both functionally and formally. Since in the end he decides it is not built to the pf. stem, he begins by trying to deny that it has past value, despite the following augmented impf., suggesting rather that it can have "generell-zeitlos" sense. This (in his view) opens the door to taking it as an injunctive, probably to a root aorist. It then owes its pf.-type ending to analogic spread from the equally non-reduplicated 3rd pl. *skambhur* (X.65.4), whose ending could belong to the pf. or, possibly, to an aorist. Since the conceptual structure of the vs., with the actions of ab contrasting with those of cd, imposes (in my view) a preterital sense on *skambháthuḥ*, I am not persuaded by Kü's general/timeless interpr. But, on the other hand, I don't need to be: Kü is still under the sway of the Hoffmannian interpr. of the injunctive, but this straitjacket of a linguistically implausible verbal "category" should not limit our readings of this maximally unmarked form-type, and there is, in my view, abundant evidence for injunctives used as straight preterites. I am therefore willing to accept that *skambháthuḥ* (and *skambhuḥ*) somehow reflect an aorist, which the root otherwise lacks, and a root aorist might be expected beside the nasal pres. *skabhnā́ti*, as Kü points out. He provides what seems to me an overly

complex analogic explanation for the full-grade root syllable, which can simply result from a formal match with the immediately following cognate instr. *skámbhanena*. (It might be noted that a putative **skabháthuḥ* with zero-grade root syllable would produce a slightly better break.) What I don't understand -- and Kü doesn't mention -- is why the verb is accented. It is right in the middle of its clause, preceded by a tonic preverb and a tonic object, so the explanations for the accents of *vividáthuḥ* (1c) and *vāsáyathaḥ* (2a) are not applicable. Perhaps it acquired its accent redactionally because the reasons for the accents of those two verbs were no longer clear.

VI.72.3: I do not understand why the Vṛtra-smashing is couched in the pres. tense, *hatháḥ*. The injunc. 2nd du. *hatám* would fit the same metrical slot, and its corresponding impf. *ahatam* was in fact used in 1d. The rest of the vs. is preterital, with augmented imperfects *amanyata* (b), *airayatam* (c) and pf. *paprathuḥ* (d). One might argue that the accented injunc. could easily be mistaken for the masc. acc. sg. ppl. as a modifier of *áhim … vṛtrám*, but *hatám* as 2nd du. impv. is fairly common elsewhere (though, it seems, not with an acc. sg. obj. that could facilitate the misidentification). Another possibility is that this is an attempt to convey relative tense in the absence of a functional pluperfect: if Heaven's giving consent (2nd half of b; *ánu … amanyata*) logically precedes the smashing itself — not a foregone conclusion: Heaven may have cheered them on while they performed the smashing — then the present *hatháḥ* would express the action that followed the one conveyed by the impf. *amanyata*. But I consider this unlikely.

    Well-attested *samudrá-* is otherwise masc.; with Lü (192 and n. 1) I take neut. pl. *samudrāṇi* in d as an adj. and supply *árṇāṃsi* from c.

VI.72.4: Ge (see also Gr) takes *āmāsu* as modifying *vakṣáṇāsu* ("in die rohen Bäuche"), which is certainly possible grammatically. However, in other instantiation of this paradox it is the cows that are raw. (See an ex. below.) Hence the publ. tr., with first the cows (a), then the udders of the cows (b) as the depoisitory of the cooked milk.

    Ge follows Gr in taking the fem. of *jágat-* (here loc. pl. *jágatīṣu*) as simply designating a female creature ("in … weiblichen Tieren"), but esp. in this context, in which the milk is held firm despite not being tied, the fact that the cows are in motion seems relevant. Cf. another phrasing of the same image in III.30.14 *āmā pakváṃ carati bíbhratī gaúḥ* "Herself raw, the cow roams about carrying the cooked (milk)," where *carati* seems to correspond semantically to *jágatīṣu* here.

    The publ. tr. might be slightly altered to reflect the unaccented *āsu* in c: "within them, the dappled moving (cows)."

VI.72.5: Ge, flg. Sāy, supplies *rayím* in ab, quite persuasively because the same phrase *apatyasā́cam śrútyam* explicitly modifying *rayím* is found in I.117.23, II.30.11. Re suggests rather *śúṣmam* on the basis of c, but this does not enter into the same formulaic nexus and seems a less likely gift in any case.

VI.73 Bṛhaspati
    Re EVP XV.66–67.

VI.73.1: Pāda c is somewhat troubled, since neither of the first two words, *dvibárhajmā prágharmasád*, is clear. Let us work from the end. The rt. noun cmpd. *prágharma-sád-* is not otherwise attested, but *gharma-sád-* 'sitting by the gharma drink/pot' is found in adjacent vss. in X.15.9–10, also characterizing *pitár-*. It is not clear what the prefixed *prá-* would add semantically (see Old, Ge n. 1c, Scar 564) nor why it should have a long vowel (if it belongs to *prá*). I therefore favor a different segmentation of the sequence, one roundly rejected by Old even as he mentioned it -- namely, to take the *prā* as the final of the preceding word, hence (in the first instance, but see below) **dvibárhajmā-prā(ḥ)*, as the root noun to √*prā* 'fill'. This requires a change in the Saṃhitā text: accenting the *prá(ḥ)* and (possibly, but see below) de-accenting *dvibárha-*, hence **dvibarhajmā-prá(ḥ)*. This root noun is common in such cmpds; see, e.g., *antarikṣa-prā-* 'filling the midspace', *rodasī-prā-* 'filling the two world-halves', with similar cosmic locales. Rather than seeing in *dvibárhajmā-* a form of *ájman-* 'course, drive' with Ge, Re, Scar 255 (e.g., Ge 'der eine doppelte Bahn(?) hat') (Schmidt B+I 214 refuses to tr.), I segment it rather as *-jmā-*, with the *-jm-* 'earth' element belonging to the archaic and multiformed *kṣám-* 'earth' word (see also Re, who, though drawn to the possibility in his comm., rejects it in tr.). The supposed prior member *dvibárha-* obviously strongly resembles the reasonably (14x) well-attested *s*-stem bahuvrīhi *dvibárhas-*. But we should expect **dvibarho-jmā-* or the like and must therefore posit either a thematic byform **-barha-* or a secondary redactional adjustment. (Wackernagel's solution, flg. Bartholomae [AiG I.339, cf. II.1.65, 125], that *dvibárha-jmā-* was simplified from **dvibárhaj-jmā*, with *-aj-* the sandhi form of *-ad-*, which in turn is a sandhi form of *-as-* before a voiced sound, seems to me without merit, though clever.)

In any case, the unclarity of the structure of the cmpd. and the uncertainty of the lexical affiliation of *-jmā-* or *-ajmā* in the posited **dvibarhajmā-prā-* could have led to redactional reanalysis, with segmentation of **prá*, which was then attached to what follows. However, one problem with my analysis is that it assumes a three-member cmpd. **dvibarha-jmā-prā-*; these are rare in the RV and might be expected to be rarer when archaic elements are involved. I therefore have a further suggestion, which also addresses another problem with the analysis. Consider VI.19.1, where Indra is described as *carṣaṇīprā utá dvibárhā(ḥ)* "filling the domains and doubly lofty." If we re-segment and readjust the beginning of our sequence here, to a two-word phrase **dvibárhā *jmā-prá(ḥ)*, **dvibárhā* can keep its accent, we are saved from positing the thematic byform (since **dvibárhā* would be nom. sg. m. to the *s*-stem), and we avoid a three-member compd. True, we have to lengthen the final of *dvibárha*, but it is already metrically heavy (before the cluster *-jm-*). This would yield a description of Bṛhaspati "doubly lofty, filling the earth" that is similar to that of Indra in VI.19.1. It also fits the thematics of the hymn; note Bṛhaspati's bellowing to the two world-halves in d and, especially, his making wide space (*ulokám … cakára*) in the next vs.

VI.73.3: I do not understand why *hánti* in d is accented. Nor does Old ("Akzent … befremdet"). Both Ge and Re evade the problem by reading pāda-init. *bṛhaspátiḥ* with the previous pāda as subj. of a nominal sentence, leaving *hánti* to begin a new cl. The publ. tr. does the same. Despite adopting the Ge/Re stratagem in my tr., I consider this solution artificial but have nothing better to offer.

VI.74 Soma and Rudra
     Re EVP IX.74 and 128.

VI.74.1: In my view, *iṣṭí-* in b is meant to express both 'desire' and 'sacrifice' (from √*iṣ* and √*yaj* respectively), encapsulating the reciprocity inherent in the compact between gods and men. Ge is sympathetic to 'sacrifice' (n. 1b) but points to the accent: 'sacrifice' is ordinarily accented *íṣṭi-*. But secondary senses (that is, puns) often ignore accentual differences, and furthermore, as JL has persuasively argued, the older accent of *-tí-*abstracts was suffixal, and selective accent retraction can be observed in the course of the Vedic period, so we might assume an older **iṣṭí-* 'sacrifice'.

VI.74.3: The nominal rel. cl. *yád … ásti* is in some sense pleonastic: the two ppl. *baddhám* and *kṛtám* could simply modify the neut. *énaḥ* directly. But the structure seems designed to sketch a two-level structure: the outrage commited (by us) *that is* bound to us. Note that abl. *asmát* should be construed with the main cl. ("unhitch, release … from us": *áva syatam muñcátam … asmát*), and so the rel. cl. is technically speaking embedded. But this seems to be one of the fairly common examples of semi-embedded izafe-type relative clauses.

VI.74.4: As often, a pattern imposed earlier in the hymn is partly altered at the end. In this case the vs.-initial voc. *sómārudrau* of 1–3 is postponed till the beginning of the 2nd pāda.
     The simplicity and banality of this hymn (and perhaps an eye to the finish line) seem to have led both Ge and Re into uncharacteristic (and independent) lapses: Ge tr. ab in the 3rd ps., despite the clear voc. *sómārudrau* and clear 2nd du. impv. *mṛḷatam*; Re twists (at considerable verbal expense and with a characteristic parenthesis) the du. *sumanasyámānā* ending the vs. as an acc. pl. modifying *naḥ*: "protégez nous (en sorte que nous ayons) l'esprit bien disposé."

VI.75 Weapons
     Re EVP XVI (1976): 109–11 provides notes; it is tr. in the earlier Hymnes spéculatifs (1956) but without philological notes.
     It is possible that this hymn was tacked onto the maṇḍala because of *tigmā́yudhau tigmáhetī* "possessing sharp weapons and sharp missiles" at the end of the preceding hymn (VI.74.3), though this is not a necessary hypothesis. The first 14 vss. are repeated in a number of places in the early Vedic ritual texts as part of the Aśvamedha (e.g., VS XXIX.38–51, TS IV.6.6).

VI.75.1: The first word of the hymn, *jūmū́tasya*, signals that we are out of the core RVic lexical domain: this word for 'thunder-cloud' is found only here in the RV, though it is fairly amply attested elsewhere in early Vedic, and it has no obvious synchronic or diachronic etymology.
     The construction of the riddle seems a bit weak to me, since the solution, given in d, *várman-*, is anticipated by its derivative *varmín-* in b.

VI.75.2: This vs. displays the proper RVic distribution of the suppletive stem of 'bow', whose nom./acc. sg. is supplied by *dhánus-* and the rest of its paradigm (and cmpding forms) by *dhánvan-*. On this suppletion see AiG III.318 and esp. the detailed disc. of Hoffmann (Aufs. I.330 = Spr. 20 [1974] 18), as well as EWA s.v. *dhánus-*. Here the instr. sg. *dhánvanā* opens pādas a, b, and d (and see loc. *dhánvan* in the next vs. 3c), while nom./acc. sg. *dhánuḥ* holds the same position in c. Gr identifies a single occurrence of *dhánva* as nom./acc. sg. (V.7.7), which would thus violate the suppletive pattern, but this is otherwise universally and rightly assigned to the homonymous stem *dhánvan-* 'wasteland'. The form *dhánva* (or quite possibly *dhánvā*) in II.33.10 is identified by Gr as a pl., which would fit the suppletive paradigm. It is generally, however, taken as a sg., which would not. However, see comm. ad II.33.10, where I now suggest restoring Gr's pl. interpr., contra the standard sg. renderings incl. that of the publ. tr. The RV suppletive pattern is soon broken: already in the AV *dhánus-* begins to acquire oblique forms.

Technically speaking, *dhánuḥ* could be an acc., modified by *apakāmám* (if this stem can be adjectival; see below), which could be tr. "he makes the bow of his rival lose its desire," but this requires supplying a generic animate subject for *kṛṇoti*. The stem *apakāmá-*, again a hapax in the RV but found elsewhere in early Vedic, is generally taken as a noun (Ge's 'Unlust' being the best rendering), but I think it possible that it's a nominalized bahuvrīhi 'having desire gone/away'; there are not enough stems of this structure to anchor the grammatical value to accentual behavior, in my opinion. In any case, lacking the useful German 'Unlust', I have tr. as if we had a lexeme *ápa √kṛ 'make (go) away', with *kãma-* as obj. Cf. *ápa-ā́ √kṛ* in passages like nearby VI.59.8 *ápa dvéṣāṃsy ā́ kṛtam* "make hatreds stay far away" (≅ III.16.5). (Gr identifies one instance of an *ápa √kṛ*, in VIII.18.7, but the verb and preverb there belong to separate constituents; see comm. ad loc.)

VI.75.3: In d *sámane*, lit. 'togethering' vel sim., has a double sense, referring to the 'gathering' of battle as well as to a festive gathering, with the latter appropriate to the female similes in the vs.

Exactly what sound is expressed by the verb *śiṅkte* is unclear (beyond possibly "shink"). Not only is this verb barely attested, but it is hard to conceive of a sound that both a maiden and a stretched bowstring would make. One of the practical questions is whether this 2nd hemistich still depicts the bowstring pulled back to the archer's ear and held there or if it has moved on to the release of the bowstring as it propels the arrow; pāda d might suggest the latter. Numerous possibilities have been tried. The publ. tr.'s 'jangles' was meant to evoke the later kāvya trope of a woman dancer with jingling anklets, but I recognize that it is a less good fit with the bowstring -- though it might work if the string has just been loosed. The only other occurrence of the verb in early Vedic (not in a repetition of this vs.) is in the riddle hymn, I.164.29, where it *may* refer to the sound that the gharma pot makes as the milk is being heated in it. The publ. tr. (JPB) renders it 'hums' there (so also Doniger), Whitney in the equivalent AVŚ passage (IX.10.7) 'twang'; the latter is an unlikely noise for a pot, but so, I think, is humming. (And certainly jangling or twanging seems out.) In our passage Ge tr. "quieckt" (squeak, squeal) and Re (Hymnes spéc.) "vibre"; in the TS equivalent (IV.6.6c) Keith "twangeth"; in the VS equivalent (XXIX.40) Griffith "whispers" (so also Maurer for the RV). Acdg. to the internet, all bows make some sort of a twanging

sound when the string is released, but the better tuned a bow is, the quieter: well-tuned bows can be almost silent. Since twanging seems excluded for a maiden and since none of the other suggestions is particularly compelling, I will stick with 'jangle', though not with much confidence.

The standard tr. take *pāráyantī* in a fairly generic sense (e.g., Ge's "die … durchhilft"), but its literal meaning 'cause to cross / reach the far shore' works just as well, if not better, if we supply 'arrow' as obj.: the bowstring celebrated here causes the arrows to cross the space from the bow to the battle.

VI.75.4: The pun on *sámana-* implicit in 3d is made explicit in 4a; the single word is held constant, but in two different senses, between the simile and the frame.

Maurer (308) considers the simile in b "a bit irregular, since, strictly speaking, it is not the bow-ends that hold the arrow, but the bowstring." But if the bow is held on a horizontal axis, with the bow ends horizontally aligned, the part of the bow between the ends dips down like a lap, and it is the lowest part where the tip of the arrow is placed. Again according to the internet, the bow should be parallel to the ground when positioning the arrow on it (an action called "nocking"); this would be the position envisioned above.

The 2ⁿᵈ hemistich depicts the positions of the ends of the bow while the arrow is shot: first (c) the two ends of the bow approach each other as the bowstring is pulled back, decreasing the vertical space between the ends -- although as far as I can tell from YouTube, the ends never actually meet. This movement is described as *saṃvidāné* 'finding each other'. The lexeme *sám √vid* often has the more abstract sense 'make an agreement', and I think this may also be operative in the passage, though I'm not quite sure how: perhaps their agreement or compact is to "pierce the rivals" (*ápa śátrūn vidhyatām*), as the rest of the pāda urges. Most tr. only recognize this latter sense in our passage (e.g., Re, Hymnes spéc., "d'un commun accord"), missing the physical sense applicable to the manipulation of the bow. In d the bowstring is released, propelling the arrow, and the two ends "spring apart" (*viṣphurántī*) and resume their position at rest. The contrastive preverb pair *sám / ví* calls attention to these contrastive actions. None of the tr. I consulted (Ge, Re, Doniger, Maurer, as well as Keith for TS and Griffith for VS) seems to have recognized that a two-step process is being described. There is one possible problem with my interpr., namely that forms of the root √*sphṛ* often take an object, and there is an acc. *amítrān* here that it could govern. However, there are a number of forms to the root that lack objects, incl. the other occurrences of the participle (VII.89.2) and nearby aor. *ápa spharīḥ* (VI.61.14). And I prefer to take *amítrān* either as a further specification of the obj. of *ápa … vidhyatām* in c or as a poorly marked acc. of goal.

VI.75.5: The expression *bahúr asya putráḥ* in the singular is somewhat surprising next to the fem. pl. *bahvīnā́m*, but Re's suggestion that it is a "bahuvrīhi défait" can be adopted, whatever we may think the grammatical process is. I have adopted Griffith's "with many a son" (both RV and VS tr.; see also Maurer), which is surprisingly apt. As is generally recognized, the masc. and fem. referents are both arrows: in addition to the standard fem. *íṣu-*, forming part of the 'quiver' cmpd itself (*iṣudhí-* in c), there are masc. 'arrow' words, incl. *bāṇá-*, found in vs. 17 below, and *śalyá-*.

Another onomatopoetic word: *ciścấ*, which is a hapax (though cf. *ciściṣākāram*, with √*kṛ* as here, not attested till the sūtras; see Hoffmann Aufs. 39). Since it expresses the sound of the quiver, "clatter" (pub. tr.), "rattle" (Doniger, Maurer), "clang and clash" (Griffith, RV and VS) all seem within reasonable range; Keith's "whiz" much less so. Again the sound may in fact just be "chishcha."

VI.75.6: Both hemistichs of this vs. express the same paradox, that an entity *behind* can lead something in front of it. In ab the good charioteer (*suṣārathíḥ*) "leads forward" (*nayati …*
puráḥ) the horses that are physically in front of him; in cd the reins, which stretch in front of the charioteer from his hands, follow his mind, which is physically behind them (*mánaḥ*
paścād ánu).

VI.75.7: The middle of *kṛṇvate* is nicely appropriate.
The publ. tr. follows Re in taking *vājáyantaḥ* as belonging to the denom. stem 'seek the prize', despite the accent (expect **vājayántaḥ), since we would otherwise expect the part. to have an object. See also Old, ZDMG 55.294 (=KlSch 753).
In its other RVic occurrence (X.163.4) *prápada-* means 'front of the foot', but here I find it hard to assume that the horses are daintily trampling the soldiers with their tippy-toes and so tr. "with their forefeet." However, since technically it seems that horses do walk/run on their toes, perhaps that's what the poet intended. Moreover, IH points out that it would be the front of the horses' hooves that would first make impact on the soldiers' fallen bodies.
The sense of *ánapavyayantaḥ* is disputed, or rather most tr. water down what I think its sense must be. It's a negated part. to *ápa* √ *vyā* 'strip off, divest' of garments, to √ *vyā*
'envelop, wrap'. See VII.81.1 *ápo máhi vyayati … támaḥ* "She [Dawn] unwraps the great darkness." But most tr. attenuate this in some way that loses the sense of the root entirely, e.g., Ge "ohne sich zu entziehen" (withdraw oneself), Griffith "never flinching," Keith "unflinchingly," Doniger "without veering away," Maurer "unrelenting"; Re (EVP) assigns it to a different root: *ápa-veti* 'cesser' (whose participle should be *-*vyant*-; he doesn't deal with the morphology), though in Hymnes spéc. he tr. "sans même s'écarter (de leur voie)." I think we should take the form seriously and I suggest that it means that the horses' trampling is so powerful that it can kill a man even while he is still in armor (hence my "without divesting"). That the form is underlyingly transitive (as I have just claimed) is disputed on principle by Lowe (*Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit*, 277), where he argues that negated participles are ("almost always") intransitive and tr. this ex. as "without withdrawing." I would dispute the principle and therefore his interpr. of this passage.

VI.75.8: I follow Ge in accepting the view of the comm. to VS XXIX.45 that *háviḥ* is a shortening of *havirdhāna-* 'oblation-deposit', with the √ *dhā* supplied by the definition found in the next pāda, containing *níhitam* 'deposited'. However, see Old in particular for other ways to interpr. *háviḥ*.
The standard tr. take *úpa … sadema* as transitive with the chariot as object: e.g., Ge "setzen," Re (Hymnes spéc.) "installer," Doniger "place," Oberlies (II.223) "setzen." But *úpa* √ *sad* is a standard locution for 'revererently approach, do honor to', and that surely is the sense here (so Griffith, Maurer "hono(u)r").

VI.75.9: On *kṛchre-śrít-* see most recently Scar (543–44). Re's (EVP) objection to Ge's tr. ("die Zuflucht in der Note") and his over-complex substitute can, I think, reasonably be dismissed.

Most tr. take *citrá-senāḥ* as containing the 'army' word (e.g., Ge "eine wunderbare Heerschar bildend"), and this is certainly possible. I interpr. it rather as 'weapon' because of the proximity of *íṣu-* 'arrow' in the adjoining cmpd *íṣubalāḥ* 'arrow-strong'.

VI.75.10: This is the last vs. of the first part of the hymn (see publ. intro.), at least by content, though the next vs. is also in trimeter meter, and it has a typically eclectic group of addressees and divine name-checks.

Pāda b could be simply a nominal sentence: "H+E (are) kindly to us," but the hortatory cast of the 2nd hemistich makes this unlikely.

Pūṣan probably makes his appearance here because he watches over roads and journeys.

The 2nd singular impv. *rákṣā* beginning d has no obvious subject. The voc. immediately preceding it, at the end of c, is pl. *ṛtāvṛdhaḥ*, as are the other vocc. in pāda a. The only available sg. is *pūṣá* in c, but he is subj. of a 3rd ps. impv. The pāda is identical to nearby VI.71.3d, where the sg. Savitar is the addressee, and it was presumably adapted from there, as Re (EVP) notes. As the last pāda of the apparent hymn-ending vs., it is not surprising that it has an external source and is only loosely attached.

VI.75.11: The "eagle" is of course the feathers that provide the fletching at the back end of the arrow. The "tooth" of the arrow is presumably its tip -- the arrowhead -- so called because it "bites" its target. The arrowhead is quite unlikely to have been made from a deer's tooth, however -- their teeth being short and flat and unsuitable for piercing. But acdg to the internet, deer antlers were/are used for primitive arrowheads. The cows in pāda b are of course leather sinews, and again the internet tells us that sinew was/is frequently used to attach the arrowhead to the shaft (with some how-to advice, which generally involves chewing on the leather first).

Pāda b recalls 5d, though the material objects in questions are different, the quiver in 5, the arrow in 11: pāda-final *prásūtā* matches *prásūtaḥ* in 5d in the same metrical position, and both contain the past part. of √*nah* 'tie' earlier in the pāda, also in the same metrical position, 5d x x *nínaddhaḥ*, 11b x x *sáṃnaddhā*

The verb of pāda d is literally "run together and apart" (*sáṃ ca ví ca drávanti*), but "clash and separate" seemed to me to have a better ring.

VI.75.12: *śárma yachatu* at the end of d responds to *śárma yaṃsan* ending the previous vs., though the vss. are in different meters.

VI.75.13: The first hemistich is strongly alliterative: *jaṅghanti … jaghánān … jighnate* and plays on two different redupl. verb forms to √*han*: the intensive and the regular redupl. pres. Although I generally agree with Schaefer that "intensives" are really frequentatives most of the time, in this particular passage the presence of the med. redupl. pres. *jighnate*, which

almost always has pl. objects (as here) and therefore fills the frequentative slot, pushes the intens. stem *jaṅghan-* towards a true intensive value.

prácetas- 'discerning' may seem an odd descriptor for horses, but the point is well captured by Doniger's "who sense what is ahead" (perhaps an expansion on Re's [Hymnes spéc.] 'prévoyant'). The horses are presumably too smart to go into battle unless they're forced by the whip.

VI.75.14: This is the last of the vss. repeated in the Aśvamedha sections of the YV.

pári is the signature word of this vs.: *páry eti* (a), *paribā́dhamānaḥ* (b), *pári pātu* (d).

On the cmpd *hasta-ghná-* see Old and Lü (ZDMG 96: 39), the latter summarized by Re (EVP).

There are numerous diff. interpr. of *vayúnāni* here. I assume that it refers to the different possible trajectories of the bowstring when it is released.

The last pāda may emphasize the masculinity of the handguard and the archer because the bowstring, from which the handguard protects the archer, is feminine.

VI.75.15: The antelope head and metal mouth of the arrow are not entirely clear. I assume that this refers to a deer-antler arrowhead (as in 11a) with a further metal tip attached to it. The internet assures me that such things have been discovered, if rarely, in archaeological contexts. Ge (n. 15b) suggests either this or that the *múkham* is the ring that connects the shaft and the arrowhead. But as far as I can tell, in my exploration of the odd internet world of makers of primitive arrowheads, there would not be a separate metal ring or socket used to attach a bone/antler arrowhead to the shaft; when there's a metal attachment, the whole arrowhead is metal.

In a hymn so attuned to the grammatical gender, and therefore of the metaphorical gender, of the key words, there is a special frisson in describing the feminine arrow (*íṣu-*) -- here in the dat. *íṣvai*, whose *-v-ai* stem+ending shows the specifically feminine inflection of short *-u*-stems -- with a cmpd that ends with *-retas-* 'semen'. The accent of the cmpd *parjánya-retas-* shows that it must be a bahuvrīhi 'having (or in this case, in my opinion, receiving) the semen of Thunder/Parjanya'; hence tr. like Re (Hymnes spéc) "semence de Parjanya," Doniger "to this seed of Parjanya" are misleading and grammatically wrong. As to what this refers to in practical terms, Re may well be correct that the shaft of the arrow is made of reed, which grows in the rains and is associated with the thunderstorm.

VI.75.16: *amī́ṣām* is of course the gen. pl. of the far deictic prn. *asaú* and could be more literally tr. as "do not leave a single one of those yonder standing," but this seemed a bit heavy.

VI.75.17: The beloved RVic contrast of *sám* and *ví* is on display here with *saṃpátanti* (a) and *viśikhā́ḥ* (b).

Strictly speaking, *iva* comes too late in the simile *kumārā́ viśikhā́ iva*, since the 'lads' must definitely belong to the simile, not the frame. This late placement is not unusual, however. Because of the multivalence of *ví* the bahuvrīhi *viśikhá-* can have two different senses and has been interpr. with both. If in this cmpd means 'without', as often, the whole

cmpd means 'without/lacking hair' -- so Gr "ohne Kopfhaare"; he is followed by Re (Hymnes spéc.) "aux crêtes dénouées" and Maurer "tuftless." By contrast, if *ví* means 'out, apart', as often, the cmpd means 'with hair apart', that is, perhaps, sticking out every which way. Ge renders it "mit aufgelöstem Haarbusch," and he is followed by Doniger "with untrimmed locks of hair" and me; Old implicitly assumes the same meaning. If the first meaning is correct, these could in fact be some kind of projectile that lacks fletching. (Acdg. to the internet, it is possible to shoot unfletched arrows, though not generally recommended.) Or perhaps the arrows lost their fletching in the intensity of the shooting. Nonetheless, this seems the less likely sense. If it means "with hair out/apart" (my "unruly hair"), it can refer either to the arrows themselves, coming in from every angle: if each arrow is compared to a strand of hair, the visual effect would be of "bedhead" hair, matted and sticking out in all directions. Or it can refer to the fletching; when innumerable arrows rain down, their feathers would again produce a chaotic visual effect.

The predicate *śárma* √*yam* returns from vss. 11–12, and 17d is identical to 12d.

VI.75.18: Note the near-rhyming forms *mármāṇi .. vármaṇā*, echoed in c by *várīyo váruṇaḥ*.

VI.75.19: I take the phrase *svó áraṇo yáś ca níṣṭyaḥ* as a three-member sequence indicating progressive distance from the speaker. I'm assuming that in this context an *áraṇa-* is someone who inhabits the same general territory, but belongs to a different group, while the *níṣṭya-* are from beyond the territory. Re's tr. (Hymnes spéc.) is in agreement: "Celui, proche ou lointain ou même étranger." Others seem to take the 2ⁿᵈ two terms as (near-)synonyms; so explicitly Klein (DGRV I.108–