Maṃḍala VI (cont'd)

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 *pītví 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 *adyā́ cin nú 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 ā́ 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 *adyā́ cin nú 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, *rayī́ṇā́m* 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 *satā́bhavo vásupatir vásūnām, dátre víśvā adhithā indra kṛṣṭī́ḥ*, 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 *t^{u}vád*, 3a *t^{u}vám*, 4a *t^{u}vám*.

My all-purpose tr. of the (more or less lexicalized) desid. to √*śak* 'be able', namely 'do one's best' (see ad I.112.19), 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") (sim. Gr), *śíkṣa-* does not elsewhere take an acc. (the few supposed passages in Gr are to be interpr. differently) but generally only a dative. See disc. ad I.112.19 etc. 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 *carṣaní-* 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 *prā́rūrucad ...*], 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 weak), 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 ... gā́ anugmán* "When the comrade with his comrades the Navagvas, the warriors, from their crouch followed after the cows." The 'knee' cmpds presumably describe the stance of the warrior-poets in this conflict, at least in these two passages. However, in VII.95.4, a hymn to Sarasvatī, it describes the position of "reverential ones" (*namasyà-*) imploring the goddess in prayer, and though there is a martial portion of VII.82.4, where another example of the stem occurs, the form in question is found in the part of the vs. that describes invocations made in peace time. The final instance of the word, in III.59.3, is too generic to pin down. Thus, it seems that a posture with "fixed knees" may be adopted in various circumstances, including that of prayer.

The second hemistich contains a series of balanced etymological figures: *púraḥ purohā́ 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, and the near-match phonologically of *-íḥ sán* with *-īyán* suggested the figure without insisting on it. 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 vā́jebhiḥ*, with the *vā́jebhiḥ* 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., *nīvyā̀bhiḥ* and *puruvī́rābhiḥ* respectively. Although two masc. instr. pls. intervene, *vā́jebhiḥ* 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 *nīvyā̀bhiḥ* as belonging to a fem. noun *nīvyā̀-*, most subsequent interpr. take it as an adj. If both *nīvyā̀bhiḥ* and *puruvī́rābhiḥ* are adjectives, we need to determine the underlying referent that they modify. As just noted, the first of these instr. is a hapax, but *puruvī́ra-* 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 *puruvī́ra-* 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 *puruvī́ra-* is a clear fem. modifying *rayí-*: X.167.1 *rayím puruvī́rām*. 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 mā́va pādi tát / gárbhaṃ ta ugraú rakṣatāṃ bheṣajaú nīvibhāryā́* "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 *kadā́ stómaṃ vāsayo 'sya rāyā́* "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-vī-* (3x), *prā-vī-* (1x), and cf. *devā-vī-* (12x) beside *deva-vī-* (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. *sṛjānā́ḥ* 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-ṣā́ṭ* picks up *turā́ya* 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.

In c the negated root noun cmpd *ánapāvṛt* can either be adverbial (so Gr and Ge) or modify *ártham* (so Scar 508). I favor the adv. reading (also in its other occurrence in X.89.3): it is surely the waters, not the goal or purpose, that do not turn aside.

VI.33 Indra

VI.33.1: The pāda-final *dā́svān*, to be read with distraction as *dáasvān*, presumably reflecting a laryngeal hiatus, resonates with *sauvaśv(i)yam* and *s(u)vaśvo* in b, despite the different sibilants. The stem *dā́svant-* (8x) must always be read distracted and presumably reflects, as already indicated by Gr, an underlying *s*-stem built to √*dā*, hence in IIr. terms **dáh-as-*.

VI.33.2: In c I tr. *ví paṇī́m̐r aśā́yaḥ* 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 ā̀naḷ 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 paṇī́ṃr ádāsan#*, which I tr. "They ... have distanced the niggards through ritual service" (for which see comm. ad loc.).

As the above disc. suggests, I take *aśā́ya-* as belonging to the root √*(n)aś*, but the morphology is not straightforward. With Whitney's tentative suggestion (Skt. Gr. §1066b), I assume it belongs with the class of *-āyá-*presents to zero-grade roots that are generally related to 9th class presents (e.g., *gṛbhṇā́ti, gṛbhāyá-*) and ultimately reflect (in my opinion, flg. Saussure) *-yá-*deverbatives built to the weak stem of the 9th class pres. (*-nH-yá-*). Unfortunately, of course, √*(n)aś* had no final laryngeal and no 9th class pres., though it does have a well-attested 5th class *aśnóti*. I must assume secondary spread of the *-āyá-*suffix to this root (see also *naśā́ya-* X.40.6, also apparently to √*naś*), perhaps facilitated by the nasal-suffixed present. MLW suggests here a clever alternative, that

aśāyaḥ actually represents a haplologized form of the causative of √*śi* 'lie', *śāyáyati*, and with *ví* means 'you caused the niggards to lie in pieces / scattered about'. Although Wh (Rts) lists this causative as beginning only in the sūtras, it may well appear once in the AV (Ś IV.18.4); see my *-áya*-formations, pp. 134–35. Although MLW's suggestion is appealing on its own -- and the haplology would not be problematic (see the *-yaya-* haplology posited above in VI.12.4) -- the other forms of the stem *aśāya-* (I.34.7, X.43.6, 92.1) are not easily amenable to a 'lie' interpr. but fit 'reach' quite well; *aśāyata* in VIII.73.9, usually grouped with these forms, I take to √*śā* 'hone, sharpen' (see comm. ad loc.).

VI.33.3: The Ārya obstacles are presumably peoples akin to us, but fighting against us. On the contrastive pairing *dā́sa- ā́rya-* in this phrase, see comm. ad VI.22.10.

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, axe'; cf., for similar context, X.89.7 *jaghā́na vṛtráṃ 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 *mṛḷīká* as loc. *mṛḷīké*, rather than Pp. *mṛḷīkáḥ*. 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.

The final pāda has a bad cadence: *goṣátamaḥ*. As MLW points out, this form should really be **goṣātamaḥ* (splv. to *goṣā́-*). Such a reading doesn't improve the

expected Triṣṭubh cadence, but it would provide a proper Jagatī cadence (and metrical variety at the end of a hymn is not unexpected). The pāda can be read with 12 syllables without difficulty: *diví ṣ́yāma pārye *goṣātamaḥ*. As for the transmitted short vowel form, it might have been changed to match *nṛtama* in 3d, although, as noted there, the light initial syllable of that form is itself metrically problematic.

VI.34 Indra

VI.34.1: The first hemistich of this vs. (and thus of the hymn) contains a compact summary of the 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., serving as another subject of the verb *paspṛdhre*, not a dual masc., which is harder to fit into the syntax of the clause -- 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. The cmpd. deviates from dvandva orthodoxy in other ways: it has only one accent, and at least in this metrical context the first member ends in short *-a* and is probably in stem form (or else show shortening in hiatus).

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 bhūt*; "has become one to be cheered on" is excessively fussy.

The instr. *asmā́bhiḥ* was unaccountably omitted in the publ. tr.: I correct to "... to be cheered on by us."

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 ī*, i.e., an example of the enclitic acc. *ī* 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 ī stotā́ra 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 stotā́raḥ*), so that the meter would be unaffected by **ī* 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 māsā́* (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 *māsā́* 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 *māsā́*, 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 *māsā́* 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 *māsā́* as an instr. of accompaniment, rather like the expression in X.138.4 *māséva sū́ryaḥ*, in which *māséva* presumably conceals the instr. *māsā́* 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 *māsā́*, 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. *-ā́* 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-ā́*. 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 *arcā́* 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 *ṛ́c-* '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. *brahmā́ṇaḥ* (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.

On *dhíyaḥ karasi vā́jaratnāḥ* see X.42.7 *kṛdhí dhíyam ... vā́jaratnām*.

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 **nīḷayā́se*) has been retracted because the form is transitive (acc. *nṝ́n ... vīrā́n*) 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 *vā́ja-śravasaḥ*, all three modifying fem. pl. *pṛ́kṣaḥ*.

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 *pṛ́kṣaḥ* 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 *śū́ro 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. *dhārāyathāḥ* 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. On the weak pf. form *yeje* (versus *īje*) see comm. ad I.114.2 and Kü 391–92.

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 *vīryā́ya* (b) and *syūmagṛ́bhe 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 devā́so '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' (*vrtrahátye*), 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-gṛ́bh-* 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 *rā́yaḥ* 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 *rā́yaḥ* 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 bhū́ma 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 (...) bhū́ma*, 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 *rā́jā*.

VI.37.2–3: The implicit identification of Indra's horses with the soma drops is reinforced by the use of the part. *ŕ́jyantaḥ* 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 *sūrīn*. 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 árugṇam*, 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 usrā́ḥ* we can add the part. *sántam*, as in IV.1.15 *gā́ḥ ... 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. *índra*, 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. *índra* 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 *ṛtayúj-* 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 *ṛtá-* 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 *ṛtayúj-* (incl. our vs. 4), all modifying 'horses', with the anodyne 'wohlgeschirrten', as opposed to our vs. 2, which he renders 'der Verbündete des Ṛta' -- 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 *gṛṇaté* 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 *sutá indra sóma ā́* 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. *ṕ́dhak*, a loc. NP *své sádane*, and a dep. clause with locatival subordinator *yátra ... ási*. It is also a nice instance of Behaghel'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, although this phenomenon is found elsewhere in the RV. See, e.g., X.10.4, 11.8 and comm. thereon.

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 *énm* (that is, *ā́* + *īm*) *enam*, a pile-up of two acc. enclitics, whose referent is postponed till the end of the hemistich, *somapā́tamam*. 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 *ā́-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 ā́ tanuṣva*, and we should therefore expect accented **práty* here as well; 2) *ā́* is already present pāda-initially in *ém*. Balanced against these problems is the fact that *ā́* is usually the 2nd preverb in a complex (see *práty-ā́ √tan* just cited), and the assumed *ā́* (...) *práti* would be quite unusual (almost no such sequences registered in MonWms). I think we must assume that, more or less simultaneously, *ā́* 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 *ā́* 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 *índra 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 *gṛṇīṣáṇi* (2x, incl. once in this maṇḍala, VI.15.6). I think our poet built *upastṛṇīṣáṇi* on the model of this *gṛṇīṣáṇi*, 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*, *staulā́-*, and *dhautárī*, the latter two also marked by vṛddhi.

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

staulā́- here is reminiscent of the likewise impenetrable *stauná-* 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 *staulā́bhir dhautárībhiḥ* scheint kein Ergebnis erreichbar"; EWA (II.762 and I.783) also throws up its hands. I am inclined to connect *staulā́-* and *stauná-* with similar words but with aspirated initial *sth-*, namely *sthūrá-* 'brawny, sturdy' and *sthū́ṇā-* '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 *nā́ma* ("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" (*sasavā́n*) 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 *ā́* √*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 (*sutā́nām*); the reason for this is immediately given in the 2nd part of pāda b, *sá hy àsya rā́jā* "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. *sutā́nām* 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 (*pā́tā* 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 (*avitā́*), 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, *pā́tram* 'drinking cup', *índrapāṉam* 'giving drink to Indra', and *apāyi* 'has been drunk', in echoing the first word of the preceding vs. (15a *pā́tā* '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 jahī́ ca*, where *jahī́* 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 *jahī́* later in the vs. As for *kṛṇuhí* in 18d, it might be taken as contrastive with the (rather distant) imperatively 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 √**steh*$_2$, viz. **steh*$_2$-*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 **sth*$_2$-*i*- would presumably metathesize to **stih*$_2$ (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 devā́ḥ*), 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 devā́ḥ* 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 *tṛtī́ya-* '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 *ā́nayat ... 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 (*ī́dṛśe*), 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. *ī́dṛśe* 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 *ṇ́ṛbhiḥ* 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 *śravā́yyān* '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. *vājānā́m* 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: *purā́* 'previously', b: *nūnám* 'now') whose joint predicate is the grdv. *hávyaḥ* (see above), the one with past reference has an overt copula, pf. *ā́sitha*, 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* (*asmā́kena*) 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 *vā́jebhiḥ* 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 *vā́jebhiḥ ... 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. *tvā́m* 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}vā́m*, prominently pāda-initial (a, c, d), while the nom. sg. at the beginning of the 2nd vs. is monosyllabic. To match disyllabic *t^{u}vā́m*, 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 *rathī́*- (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 *satrāhā́* (3a) echoes *satrā́* 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 táṃ 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 *vṛṣabhā́ iva*, which is phonologically impeccable, but what form would *vṛṣabhā́* 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. *vṛṣabhā́* 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 *vṛ́ṣan-* 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 *prā́ḥ* 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. *tvā́m* from 1a, c, d returns here, again as object of "we call," but with *hūmahe* rather than the *hávāmahe* of vs. 1.

On *pibdaná-* see also comm. ad IX.15.6. The stem is obviously derived from a redupl. form of √*pad*; cf. the hapax med. part. *píbdamāna-* (X.101.11). The orig. sense is likely 'keep stepping, go step-by-step,' vel sim., as an iter. See EWA s.v. *PAD*, with ref. to Strunk and Gotō. A literal gloss could then be 'plod, trudge'. This literal sense is seen, in my view, in the participle in X.101.11 *váhnir āpíbdamānaḥ* 'plodding draught horse', and in IX.15.6 I also take *vásūni pibdaná* as a somewhat comic reference to cows as "plodding goods." Our passage here is more difficult, as the word is contrasted with *vithurá-* 'wavering'; this opposition accounts for the standard glosses as (Gr) 'feststehend, fest', (AiG II.2.595 'fest' (but .203 'erstarkend'), (Ge) 'dauerhaft', (Re) 'solides' (both latter in IX.15.6), but my 'gain(ing) a foothold' seems to preserve the root etymology and sense, while fitting the context.

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. *nṛ́ṣāhye* "at the conquering of men" and the purpose infinitival phrase

amitrā́n ... 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 *vṛdhé √bhū* 'be for strengthening / be there to strengthen', each with the complement enclitic *naḥ*. 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 *priyā́* as modifying fem. pl. *tanvàḥ*, but the sandhi context of *priyā́* makes this impossible: it would have to be **priyā́ḥ*. 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 *tanvàḥ* 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 *chardíḥ* of c, but in 12 it is the mortal champions (*śū́rāsaḥ*) 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 *tanūpā́ḥ* '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. *yāváyā* '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 *árvataḥ* 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 á*nu svā́ḥ*, IV.40.4 *ánu saṃtávītvat*, IV.45.6 *ánu svadháyā*, V.32.10 *ánu svadhā́vne*, V.34.1 *ánu svadhāmitā*, 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 suvānā́sa*, 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 ráthyeva svānīt* "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., *papivā́ṁ 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 urvīḥ* 'you six broad goddesses', again with uncertain referent – though I now accept the standard view that these are the six cosmic spaces; see comm. ad locc. 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 nivā́ta 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 # d̥yā́m*, with *úd* the final of pāda a and *d̥yā́m* 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 *śatāvann*. 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 *śatāvan-*, 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 *trātā́ram* and *sᵘvávāmꣳ ávobhiḥ* matching *avitā́ram*; 13a then repeats *sutrā́mā sᵘvávān*. 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 *sumṛ́līko bhavatu* is a variant of 10a *mṛ́ḷá*, 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 purū́ṇi*, 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 *ánānubhūtīḥ* 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 *rūpáṃ-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 (Bṛhatī, 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. *vasnayántā* is a hapax, but related to *vasná-* 'price', *vásnya-* '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" (*śāmbaráṃ 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. MLW suggests an alternative etymology, connecting it to *yáśas-* 'glory', etc. and taking it as a med. root formation meaning 'made famous, ennobled, glorified'. Both the morphology and the root semantics would work, though I am somewhat skeptical that a middle formation of that sort would have transitive-factitive sense.

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 suvī́raḥ* 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" (*apā́m ojmā́nam 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 *śaṃsiṣaṃ*. 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 *rā́sva* and *váṃsva*, although the position of *utá* associates it esp. with *rā́sva*.

VI.48.5: Because of the context, which contains other landscape features, I now think *ádrayaḥ* here might be better tr. 'mountains', at least as an alternative.

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. *vidā́ḥ* (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.; see esp. parallel *codaya* in b. Although neither Gr nor Lub gives other imperatives to this stem, most of the forms analyzed as *vidā́ḥ* 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 *héḷāṁsi daívyā ... [á]devāni hvárāṁsi ca.* The inner terms, *daívyā ... ádevāni*, are of course etymologically related, but, though both neut. pl. *a-* stems, have different endings; the outer terms, *héḷāṁsi ... hvárāṁsi* 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 hvárāṁsi*. Klein (DGRV I.53) says that *ádevāni hvárāṁsi* "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*C*asam*.

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 *mandráṃ 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 *pūṣā́ 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 *á √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. *anarvā́nam* for expected neut. **anarvá-* is found with the very same neut. acc. referent *śárdho mā́rutam* 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 *anarvā́ṇam* as only modifying Puṣan (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 *aghā́ 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 (*kākambī́ra-* 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 *karambhā́d-* '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 nī́naśaḥ*, 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 the 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. *nī́naśaḥ* is accented because it starts a new clause. Unfortunately I cannot explain why we have a redupl. aor. injunc. rather than a caus. impv. (**nāśáya*) following the first 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 *mā́* + *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 evā́*; the Pp. takes *áha* as *áhar*, but, needless to say, this sandhi would be unusual; 3) *evā́* 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 *evā́ 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) *sū́raḥ* can be nom. sg. of the thematic stem *sū́ra-* 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 *mā́ ... 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 *sū́raś cakrám prá vṛhat ...*; I.174.5 *prá sū́raś cakrám vṛhatād abhī́ke* [=IV.16.2]; V.29.10 *prā́ñyác cakrám avṛhaḥ sū́ryasya*. In two of these three passages the gen. sg. of 'sun' is *sū́raḥ*. 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. *sū́raḥ*. This is supported by a nearby passage in a Pūṣan hymn, VI.56.3 *utā́dáḥ paruṣé gávi*, *sū́raś*

cakráṃ hiraṇyáyam / ny airayad rathītamaḥ "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 *sū́raḥ* as here. The detachment might result 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 *áhaivā́*. But if a new clause begins with *evā́*, as I think it does, the unusual sandhi break would be more understandable.

Starting a new clause solves the problem of non-initial *evā́* 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 *grīvā́ḥ* '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 *grīvā́ḥ* √*dhā*, I conjecture that this describes one action in the harnessing of horses to the chariot. Note √*dhā* in VII.34.4 *ā́ dhūrṣú asmai dádhātāśvān* "Put the horses to the chariot poles for him," and recall that the horse Dadhikrā is "bound at the neck" (*grīvā́yām 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 *evā́* 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. (*dṛ́teḥ*), 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* – though see AiG III.239, acdg. to which *-hā́* can also serve for the neut. (see comm. ac X.170.3). However, MLW suggests that the neut. could have been simply the sten form **vṛtrahán*, which could be misheard as *vṛtrahám*. See also 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" (*sakṛ́t*) 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 *pṛ́śnyā dugdhā́m sakṛ́t páyas, tád anyó nā́nu 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 *mártes̱v anyád dohase pīpā́ya, sakṛ́c chukrā́m dudhe pṛ́śnir ū́dhaḥ*, 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 *ū́dhaḥ* 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 *ū́dhaḥ* 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 *sakṛ́t* 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 ..., víṣājani pṛ́śnyāḥ śukrá ūdhani* "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 *vṛ́ṣā śukráṃ duduhe pṛ́ṣnir ūdhaḥ* 'the bull as Pṛśni milked gleaming (milk/semen) from his (/her) udder' and in VI.66.1d *sakṛ́c chukráṃ duduhe pṛ́ṣnir ūdhaḥ* 'only once did Pṛśni 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 Pṛśni'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, Pṛśni, 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 *jínvatam*, 11c *jínvathā*, 14d *jínvatu*), 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 aryamā́* (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 *aryamā́* in a Triṣṭubh cadence where *aryamā́* 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 *divás pṛthivyór 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 *sū́ro anyā́* "the other is the sun's" follows Old, who adopted it from Ludwig. Ge (/Re) supply an instr. *raśmíbhiḥ* 'with the rays', parallel to *stṛ́bhiḥ*, on which *sū́raḥ* depends. This seems unnec. Re's claim that the accent on *pipiśé* "déconseille l'interpretation de *sū́raḥ* 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 *parjányāvā́tā vṛṣabhā́ purīṣíṇā*. The only question is whether *pṛthivyā́ḥ* in our passage depends on *vṛṣabhā́* or the watery outpourings: its accent (as opposed to unaccented voc. *vṛṣabhā*) 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 *sthā́tar-* 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 kṛnudhvam* 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, *ā* + *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 *agníṃ 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 *dhī-* 'visionary thought', as here.

Most take *vacasyā́* as instr. sg. to the *-ā́* stem *vacasyā́-* '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) *vacasyā́* 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 *vacasyā́* here is indeed a verb and has borrowed its verbal accent from *vardháyā*.

The phrase *kā́mena 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: *rudráṃ dívā ... rudrám aktaú* "Rudra by day ... Rudra by night." Given this accented, non-initial, 1st sg. subj., I wonder if *vacasyā́* 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 *ṛ́dhak* 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 *varasyā́-* 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 *varivasyā́ gṛṇānáḥ* "singing (to you) with a desire for space," comparable to our *gṛṇató varasyā́*.

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. *yūthā́* '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 *víprāḥ ... 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."

For "hard-pressed Manu" (*mánave bādhitā́ya*), see the same phrase in VII.91.1, where, as here, a god (or gods) perform(s) a cosmogonic deed that allows the sacrifice to be instituted.

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, *agnijihvā́ḥ* '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 vakmarā́jasatyāḥ*.

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 *yathā́* 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. However, it would be possible to construe the two pronouns separately but within the confines of the *yáthā* clause: "so that there will be for us a flawless wide realm for our peaceful dwelling" or, perhaps better, "... for us to dwell peacefully." For a similar doubling, see X.99.8 and comm. ad loc.

Since the shelter and wide realm we wish for are physical in nature, on the basis of my reinterp. of *anehás-* (comm. ad X.61.12) I would now substitute "flawless" for the more morally focused "faultless." See also the "flawless path" in the next hymn, VI.51.16.

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) reçevant 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 yajñā́nām*, 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-pūṣáṇ-* (cf. nearby VI.57.1), *somā-pūṣáṇ-*, 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 (*śrutvā́ 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 *rā́sat* in the configuration #*śrávat ... úpa ca stávāno, rā́sat* ...), but placed after the preverb of the verbal lexeme in the 2nd clause (that is, by his interpr. *úpa ... rā́sat*). 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 *vā́jān*. 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 *víprā* 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 freed Atri from great darkness, (so)

cause (us) to pass out 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 ... evā́* "just as ..., even so ..." — as in a childbirth spell: V.78.7 (cf. also 8) *yáthā vā́taḥ puṣkaríṇīm, samiṅgáyati sarvátaḥ / evā́ te gárbha ejatu* "As the wind sways a lotus-pond in every direction, so 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 *tū́rvataṃ narā* as a parenthetical clause. This allows the abl. phrase at the end of d, *duritā́d abhī́ke* "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., *divyā́ḥ pā́rthivaso, 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: *divyā́ḥ* because of its non-initial accent, *pā́rthivāsaḥ* 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. *devā́ḥ* 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.35.14, 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 Mamatā́, 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 *hūtā́saḥ* 'invoked', here by *hutā́saḥ* '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 *gnā́ḥ* '(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 *mitrā́-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 *ā́(m̐)*. Generally in this position *ā́* 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.

Pāda b is a 12-syllable Triṣṭubh, which can be fixed by reading **devā́ñ* for *devā́nāṃ* -- an archaic (or truncated) gen. pl. likely found in other passages containing *jánman-* (I.71.3, VI.11.3, X.64.14). The restoration of **devā́n* is supported by Lanman (Noun Infl. 354, Arnold 101, 307, Old, etc.). On this form see disc. esp. ad X.64.14. The full phrase, *devā́nāṃ jánma* is found in this same hymn, VI.51.12, where it is metrically impeccable; the change of **devā́ñ* to *devā́nām* in our vs. can be ascribed to the influence of the phrase in 12.

Old strenuously objects to taking *sanutár ā́ ca* as a conjoined phrase of directional elements (flg. BR), and Re agrees with him. I do not see the problem; *ā́* 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-nī́-*. 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 *sadhanī́-*. 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. MLW alternatively suggests that the stem is a *vṛkī* deriv. to *sadhána-*. This would account for the morphology more easily that what was just sketched; however, it would have to be masc. *vṛkī* form. Not impossible of course (cf. *rathī́-*), but one more required assumption.

VI.51.4: 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 suvasanā́ni*, 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 dāṭ́ṛn*), 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 *nṛ́n* 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* / *nṛ́n*, 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 mā́tar 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 *mā́ ... 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 *ā́ vivase* (a, d) in the same way. As the desid. to √*van*, *vivāsa-*, esp. with *ā́*, 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 *ā́ vivase*, one of which is construed with instr. *námasā*. Here we have the verb form *ā́ name*, which imitates *ā́ 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-rā́ja-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-rā́ja(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: *kṣā́ma* and *pṛthivī́*, though adjacent.

The list of strengtheners in ab is oddly assorted, but up till the last term they are all divinities or (*pṛthivī́*) 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); see now comm. ad loc.

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 *sugopā́ḥ* '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. (*bhā́radvājaḥ ... 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 *hotā́* 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 *kṛdhī*: "Schaffe gute Fahrt." I assume that one of his motivations is the accent on *kṛdhī*, 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, *kṛdhí* 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 ... kṛdhí 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.

On the basis of my reeval. of *anehás-* (see comm. ad X.61.12) I would now substitute the tr. "on the flawless path," since our desire is for a physically perfect path, not a morally blameless one. See also comm. ad VI.50.12.

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; see comm. ad VII.104.10), 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 *atiyā́já-* (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 *vṛjinā́ni* 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 *vṛjinā́ni* 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 *devā́hūtau* breaks the series entirely -- until the next vss.

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

Ge and Re interpr. *devā́n* as a truncated gen. pl., which would be esp. unusual in pāda-initial position (pāda-final being at least arguably more plausible, since truncation and the adjustment of cadences in different meters are possible factors). 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 *ā́gamiṣṭhaḥ* ("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 *devā́n* 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 *ā́gamiṣṭhaḥ* (so Re)? Or should we supply other verbs? Ge supplies "sei" with cd, but keeps b with a, implicitly making Sarasvatī another subj. of *ā́gamiṣṭhaḥ*. 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 amṛ́tasya yé*. The only grammatical way to interpr. this is as a tag nominal rel. cl. *amṛ́tasya 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 amṛ́tasya putrā́ḥ*. 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-vā́tā 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" (*prajā́vatīr 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 *dhī-* '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 *vā́ma-*; 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-*/*vā́ma-* '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 *kikirā* 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 *dhī*- 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 *mā́kiḥ ... mā́kīm ... mā́kim*, 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 *mā́kīm* as 'nimmer, nicht', as against *mā́kis* '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 *mā́kis* is personal ("puisse aucun(e)") while *mā́kim* 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. See a similar use of *nákīm* in VIII.78.4.

On Hoffmann's analysis of *neśat* as a redupl. aor. to √*naś*, see comm. ad IV.1.17.

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 sákhā́yam* -- 3 *rāyáḥ ... sákhā* / 3 *ajāśva* -- 4 *ajā́śvam* / 4 *svásur ... jāráḥ* -- 5 *svásur jāráh.* 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. *vā́m* '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 *ī́śānaṃ rāyá īmahe* in VI.54.8c. There I interpr. *rāyáḥ* as both a gen. sg. with *ī́śānam* and an acc. pl. with *īmahe*. In our vs. here, *ī́śānam* is found in pāda b with an undoubted gen. phrase *rā́dhaso 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 *ī́śānam* takes the gen., which in turn suggests that *rāyáḥ* in 54.8 may have that reading too.

VI.55.3: The āmreḍita *dhī́vato-dhīvataḥ* 'of every visionary' recalls the focus on *dhī́-* in the nearby hymn (VI.53.1, 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 *niṣ́rmbhā́ḥ* 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 *-śrī-* in such cmpds as meaning "vollkommendmachen": see her KlSch. 352 n. 19 for the transmitted reading of this cmpd *jana-śrī-* 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 *-śrī-* 'splendid with his sharp (goad)' vel sim., more in keeping with my interpr. of other *-śrī-* cmpds like *ghṛta-śrī-* 'splendid with ghee'. On the multiple semantic possibilities of *-śrī-* 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 *ā́ √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 *ā́ √diś* in nearby VI.48.14 is similar; see disc. there. See also VI.57.2 below. MLW adds arguments supporting my interpr.: "In Vedic prose *ā́ √diś* is used to refer to the specification of which god gets which offering and I think this may be an old old meaning of this verb with parallels in Umbrian."

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" (*rathī́tamaḥ* in 2a and 3c), because in the immediately preceding hymn *rathī́-* (VI.55.1c), *rathī́tama-* (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.

The *paruṣé gávi* tr., "in 'the gray cow'," is of course masc., so should perhaps be "gray bull," though I meant cow=bovine. The phrase is reminiscent of V.27.5 *paruṣā́ḥ ... ukṣánaḥ* "gray bulls/oxen," but that phrase is in a dānastuti and does not help us with the metaphor here. For another possible – if extremely tenuous – connection see comm. ad X.5.5. If, as I suggest in the publ. intro., the image is of sunrise through a gray cloudbank, it may be related to another obscure passage, X.55.5, where something gray (*palitá-*, not *paruṣá-* as here) swallows the moon.

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 *sā́dhantām ... 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 vayā́m 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 ... vayā́m iva* "like the branch of a tree." In the simile itself *iva* is wrongly placed (expect * *vṛkṣasya-iva vayā́m*). It is also doubtful that *prá* is in tmesis from the verb *(ā́) rabhāmahe*, since *prá* never otherwise occurs with

√*rabh*, which is very common with *á*. 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 altogether rare and is therefore less puzzling. Note the similar placement of the simile marker in the much more elaborate simile involving a tree branch in X.134.6 *pū́rvena ...padā́, ajó vayā́ṃ yáthā* "as a goat [grasps] a branch with its forefoot."

All of this may have something to do with the poet's attempt to set up the play *vayám* (a), *vayā́m* (b), though that play would have been more effective if *vayā́m* were pāda-final, not followed by *iva*.

VI.57.6: The lexeme *úd* √*yu* is found only here in the RV. Ge tr. "lassen ... die Zügel schiessen," approx. "give free rein to" (sim. Re). Since *ní* √*yu*, with *ní* the oppositional preverb to *úd*, can mean 'rein in' (see disc. ad X.93.9), this makes sense – hence my 'ease up on'.

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 -- *ajā́śva-* '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 pṛ́thivyā́ḥ / ubhé abhí priyátame sadhásthe, ā́ ca parā́ 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. MLW adds that this is true "certainly in Roman rituals like the Lemuria and Feralia."

All of this speculation is tissue-thin, and I do not set 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 (*dūtyā́m sūryasya*) 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 pṛ́thivyā́ḥ* "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 vrā́: Evidence for the svayaṃvara in the Rig Veda?" (Fs. H.-P. Schmidt). It is very telling that Puṣan is given to Sūryā here (*yáṃ devā́so ádadhuḥ sūryā́yai*) rather than the reverse: the ordinary description of marriage, at least later, is *kanyā-dāna-* 'the gift of a maiden', but here she receives rather than being given, presumably a nod to her active role in the Svayaṃvara. Note the much more conventional depiction of Sūryā's wedding (to a different bridegroom) in the wedding hymn, X.85.9 *sūryā́ṃ yát pátye ... savitā́dadāt* "when Savitar gave Sūryā to her husband."

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 *ā́*. 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 sacā́ṁ* 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.

víśūcaḥ 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. *padā́* as an instr. sg. of 'foot'. Cf. with the same phrase, incl. the same verb, I.51.6 ... *arbudáṃ ní kramīḥ padā́* "With your foot you [=Indra] trampled down Arbuda" and, with a diff. root but the same preverb, also of Indra, VIII.64.2 *padā́ paṇī́m̐r arādháso*, *ní bādhasva* "With your foot stamp down the ungenerous niggards." Ge and Re take *padā́* 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.

The 3rd sg. *śnáthat* that opens the hymn is somewhat puzzling morphologically. The root √*śnath* has a poorly attested verbal system, save for the *-áya*-transitive and associated redupl. aor.; besides *śnáthat* it consists only of two exx. of the athem. impv. *śnathihi*, and a couple of *-iṣ*-aor. forms. Narten (258–59) argues convincingly that *śnathihi* should belong to a root aor. (rather than a root pres., as it is generally classed), which could serve as the base for the formation of the *-iṣ*-aor. Our form *śnáthat* could formally easily be a subjunctive to this root aor., but the problem is that a subjunctive works quite badly in context, esp., since it is explicitly conjoined (by *utá*) with the following pres. indic. *sanoti*. It could alternatively be the injunctive to a them. stem, though in that case it would be the only representative of that stem. Narten discusses *śnáthat* in n. 810, where she rather says that though it's used in a general sense, nothing stands in the way of its being a subj. to the root aor. I find this somewhat disingenuous, as subjunctives aren't generally (/ever?) used in such a sense. She also allows the possibility that it could be injunctive to a thematic stem. (see also Klein DGRV I.366, who allows either). Much as I dislike multiplying entities, I'm inclined to go for the thematic injunctive for functional reasons. Unfortunately a root aor. injunc. **śnathīt* would have been easy to build, so the thematization cannot be the result of avoiding a problematic form.

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), *mṛdh(aḥ)* (5a), *mṛḷ(ātaḥ)* (5c).

VI.60.6: On the formula *vṛtrā́ni ā́ryā ... dā́sāni* see comm. ad VI.22.10.

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.60.10: The root √*svañj* is ordinarily middle; it has only two active forms, this one (*pariṣvájat*) and the plupf. *paryáṣasvajat* in I.182.7. The latter can be explained as an *áduhat*-type remarking of the middle pf. *ṣasvaje* (see comm. ad loc.), but this active remarking of the them. pres. *-ṣvájate* is harder to explain. Gotō (1st Kl., 338–39) notes the prevailing middle voice and this anomalous act., but makes no attempt to account for it.

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 responsion *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. For *śúṣma-* as the characteristic noise of Sindhu, another river, see X.75.3.

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 *bṛ́ṣaya-* 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 Bṛṣa was a *paṇí-*. I do not understand why *víśva-* modifies this PN: "every Bṛṣaya" meaning Bṛṣaya and his ilk? his kin? (MLW adds "In Latin a name can be used in the plural to mean 'people like X' Multi Mani Ariciae 'There are many manius types at Aricia' This is no doubt a universal.") 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 tṛca 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 *devī́ sárasvatī*, and the b pādas of 4 and 6 contain responsive material: *vā́jebhiḥ vājínīvatī* (4) and x x *vā́jeṣu vājini*. Otherwise, as a helper (*avitrī́*) 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 *avitrī́*.]

VI.61.5–6: This, the middle vs. of the tṛca, 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 tṛca (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 *syā́ ... 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 *anyā́ḥ* 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-vāje*: "'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 (though Lü would presumably favor that).

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. *mahimnā́* 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. *mahinā́* with the (old) cluster reduction of *-mn-* to *-n-*. If we accept the Pp. interpr., the adjacent words *mahimnā́ mahínā* would implicitly play on both forms of the instr., with the nom. sg. *mahínā* differing from the standard instr. *mahinā́* 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 *anyā́ḥ*, 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 c *usrā́* is taken as du. by Gr., flg. the Pp. However, it more likely represents *usrā́ḥ* in sandhi, a gen. sg. fem. See extensive disc. by Old ad II.39.2, as well as his brief acknowledgement of this underlying form in his comm. on this vs..; Ge’s tr. reflects this interpr. Inter alia, 3 (V.3.8, 45.8, VIII.46.21) of the 5 occurrences of *vyúṣi* are preceded by a fem. gen. sg. *asyā́(ḥ)*, referring to Dawn, and the 4th (besides this one) has a voc. of Dawn *uṣo vyúṣi* (VII.81.2). On fem. gen. sg. *usrā́ḥ* see comm. ad VI.3.6

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* √*il 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* "the circuit that is unslackening," 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. In fact I now would accept the izafe interpr., which eliminates the badly positioned subordinating *yád*. I would still supply a form of √*yā* as the verb of pāda a, but not in a subordinate clause. This in fact allows me to supply a form of the impv., which the *tā́* invites (see above). I would now close vs. 2 with a full stop, and tr. 3a "Drive this circuit which is unslackening."

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. The "age-old Hotar" is of course Agni.

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: The narrative précis in pāda c belongs with the equally bare-bones accounts in I.117.16, 116.20, X.39.13, and esp. I.119.6. Because this seems to refer to one of the Aśvins' previous deeds, I have tr. the supposed injunctive *yātam* (so Pp) as a preterite. Note in fact that nothing forbids extracting an augmented form *ayātam* from the sequence *rathyāyātam*; see the clear *ayātam* in I.116.20 depicting the same myth.

Although *śayú-* has been reinterpr. as meaning 'orphan' in some of its occurrences (see comm. ad IV.18.12), given the favoring of PNs in Aśvin hymns and the lack of an

'orphan' context here, I retain the PN.

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. *bhū́ma*) is disputed. Ge considers it to belong to a (hapax) adj. stem **bhū́man-* 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 *bhū́man-* '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 *bhū́mi-*. He objects that we should expect (and do indeed get) *bhū́myām* 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 *bhū́mau* 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 ... bhū́mā*, which distantly evokes *dyā́vā-bhū́mī*. 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) *rā́jānau* "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 *rā́jānāu*, but, as Re points out, the two are rather distant, and further I know of no other passages in which *rájas-* is construed with *rā́jan-*, although that expression would be appealingly alliterative -- though it is true that M+V are called *dhartā́rā 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-vā́c-*. 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 śīrṣā́ṇi ... 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 *pā́ntam*. 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 chin)."

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 *nā́satyā* 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. (MLW comments simply "Cf. Gk. βίη Ἡρακλείη.") 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 (*vā́ṇī*) 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 *vā́ṇī* '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 ... *vā́k ... 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 *vā́ṇī* 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 *pŕkṣam* 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 √**u̯edh* 'lead', no longer found in Indo-Aryan as a verbal root. (I suggest an alternative etym. of *iṣudhyá-* ad I.128.6 and more fully in my forthcoming article "Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūidiia-*: The Aim of Praise.") 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, since kindling wood is Agni's source of strength. 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 *pūrvī́ḥ* (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 ... suṣṭutī́ḥ*) 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 *pakvā́* 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 *sumī́lhé śatám peruké ca pakvā́*, we may supply **śatā́(ni) *gávām pakvā́* "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 *pakvā́* 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. *pakvā́* 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 *abhiṣā́ca* interpr. as an inf. **abhiṣā́ce* 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 **abhiṣā́ce* (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. *ṛṣvā́n*; 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. Perhaps, as MLW suggests, simply a shortened du. voc.

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 á* [so Pp., Saṃhitā *sā́*] *vaha yā́*, replicates almost exactly the beginning of 4c, *sā́ na á vaha*. The close similarity of the two openings supports the disjoining of *sā́* in 5a into *sā́ á*, 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. *yā́ ha devī́* 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.

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 pitubhā́jaḥ* "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 *duhitā́ diváḥ* "daughter of heaven," but it has been elaborated here by the cmpd *divojā́ḥ* '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: *rāmyā́su ... támasaś cid aktū́n* "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 ū́rmyāyāh* (with acc. *támaḥ* as head noun, against the dep. gen. *támasaḥ* in the previous vs. (1d). With *ū́rmyā-* 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 *idā́* (4a, 4b, 4c, 5a) see publ. intro. The two outer exx. are both *idā́ 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, ṚV 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 *pīpā́ya* 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. *eṣām* 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 *eṣām*? 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 *(eṣām*) 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 *sakṛ́t* 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 Pṛśni 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 Pṛśni, 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 ī́(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 Pṛśni. In fact, both Ge and Re (tr.) do wriggle out of it, by making *sét* [= *śā́ íd*] *pṛ́śniḥ* a nominal sentence (Re's "elle (s'appelle) Pṛśni" 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* -- Pṛśni -- who emplanted the embryo. (Interestingly, while Re follows the Ge tack in his tr., in his comm. he embraces the paradox: "c'est Pṛśni 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 Pṛśni (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. *subhū́-* 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 jātā́ḥ subhvàḥ* "born all at once, good in essence." As with *mahā́ḥ* 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 *nā́hám 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, *ayā́*. 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 a way 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 hymn) (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 mṛkṣīṣta 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 *dohā́se*: in 1c the other (=non-Pṛśni) udder constantly gives milk (*dohā́se*) to mortals (*mártеṣu*), while here in 5a Pṛśni does not give milk (*ná ... dohā́se*) 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 yāsad* (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 *makṣú* 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. *stū̃na-*, *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 *nū́ 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: *ugrā́ḥ* in 6a picks up the last word of 5, *ugrā́n*. It is also barely possible that *suméke* 'well-fixed' to √*mi* 'fix, implant' resonates with *staunā́ḥ* 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 *staunā́(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 *svā́śociḥ* at the end of previous pāda as part of the postponed simile (*svā́śociḥ*, ... *ná rókaḥ*# "like a self-blazing light"). Although *svā́śociḥ* 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 *pathyā́* 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* (...) *pā́r*^{i}*ye* / *pā́r*^{i}*ye divā́*# "on the decisive day," a locution found quite commonly in the VIth Maṇḍala (VI.17.14, 23.2, 33.5, 40.5; also *pā́r*^{i}*ye 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 idhānā́ḥ* "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 *bhrā́jajjanmānaḥ* '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 *bhrā́jad-ṛṣti-* in a immediately following the identically formed hapax *bhrā́jaj-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 *girā́yo nā́paḥ* (= *ná ā́paḥ*), 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 *mitrā́váruṇā* 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. *mitrā́váruṇā* 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 weaselly tr. "comme (avec) une rêne" [EVP V]). But *-mā* instr. to *-man*-stems are rare; AiG cites only the likewise hapax *drāghmā́* 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 *-ā*-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.

The verb form *yamátuḥ* is generally assigned to the pf. stem (Gr, Wh Rts, Kü), though Lub lists it with the root aor., labelling it a nonce. Kü (399) derives this non-redupl. pf. by analogy to "nur scheinbar reduplikationslosem *takṣathur : takṣur*" to the 3rd pl. injunc. root aor. *yamur*. Since there is no real semantic connection between the two roots √*yam* and √*takṣ*, and the supposed model *takṣathur* is found only once in the RV, in Maṇḍala X (as opposed to the well-established redupl. pf. *tatákṣa*, etc.), this seems an unlikely channel. A more likely one is found in the immediate context: the pāda ends ...

yamátur yámiṣṭhā, with the dual splv. "best controllers" serving as subj. to the etymologically identical verb. In these circumstances substituting the root syllable *yam* found in the splv. for the weak form *yem* found in the proper dual pf. *yemáthur* (2x; cf. also 3rd du. *yematur*) would not be surprising.

VI.67.2: The first hemistich displays a sort of contrastive ritual synesthesia. 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, on which see my forthcoming "Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian."

VI.67.3: For the connection of the first hemistich, and esp. b, with 2ab, esp. 2b, 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 *apnasthā́ḥ* in c is of unclear meaning and has an uncertain grammatical identity; the following simile *apáseva* has been variously interpr.; *śrudhīyatā́ḥ* 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 *yā́* in the early part of the hymn: 1) PREV + dual rel. pronoun in the initial sequences *sáṃ yā́* (1c), *sáṃ yā́v* (our 3c) (as well as *prá yā́* [4c] and, with slight transformation, *pári yád* [5c]); 2) dual verbs *yamátuḥ* (1c), *yantám* (2c), *ā́ 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 yā́* (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-sthā́-*. 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 *-sthā́-* 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 *dyún*, b *dyoḥ*, 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" (*jaṭháram 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: *yā́ te jihvā́ madhumatī́ sumedhā́, 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 *mā́ 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. In the comm. to II.29.4 I consider an alternative interpr. with *ṛté*

the loc. of *ṛtá-* 'truth'. If I were to do so here, the passage could mean "when the spoked wheel (of the sacrifice) [=Agni] has come into existence / has been realized for you at/in the truth [=the sacrifice or place of sacrifice?]." I still prefer the publ. solution.

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 *ápʲyaḥ* 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 *ápʲyaḥ ... putrā́ḥ*, 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 *ápʲyaḥ* 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 *ápʲyaḥ* 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-pí-*, with nom. pl. **apíyaḥ*, but I would suggest that this unclear hapax would have been attracted to the reasonably well-attested 'watery' stem *ápʲya-* 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 *ā́d* 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. *manānā́ḥ*, 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 mahitvā́*) 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 *priyā́ dhā́ma 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 mahitvā́* 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: On *avóḥ* see AiG III.535, Lub 121.

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 (followed by Watkins, Dragon 171). 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-* (*yā́*, *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 *śruṣṭí* — 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 ..."

Judging from the fuller expression of X.50.3, which contains both *iṣé* and a form of *sumná-*, the point here is that Indra and Varuṇa will *receive* refreshment at the sacrifice and will *dispense* their favor to the performer thereof.

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 (*náraḥ*) is contrasted with *gnā́ḥ*, as male to female, and identifies these *náraḥ* 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 *narā́ṃ 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 standard 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) / *dā́svān* (c); ***iṣā́ sá dviṣā́s***.

VI.68.6: The publ. tr. failed to render *devā*; 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 attempted 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 (*itthā́ 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, *samrā́j-* 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 insistent but elementary phonetic/etymological figure: *víṣṇaḥ ... vṛṣaṇā́ 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 indraique" 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 *matīnā́m* 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, *matī́nām* 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 pr̥ṇethām*. But we might expect an instr. *sómena* in that case (as in V.34.2), and the enjambment envisioned here is very mild. See a parallel in X.104.2, where the gen. also is better construed with a preceding form of √*pā*.

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 ÉVP.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-dúgha-* '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: On the construction *bhúvanānām abhiśríyā*, see comm. ad X.66.8.

pṛthvî 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-pṛthivî* in the next pāda (also 4a, 5a). By an accident of grammar, the nom./acc. dual fem. (in *pṛthvî*, here modifying the dual dvandva) and the nom. singular. fem. *pṛthivî* 'earth' have the same ending *-î*. This grammatical pun is only actualized fully in the final vs. of the hymn, where we get the conjoined singular NP *dyaúś ca pṛthivî 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. This pāda is found twice elsewhere: VIII.27.16 and X.63.13. In both those cases, I tr. the abl. phrase "from his foundation" (that is, the foundation of the subj. of *jāyate*) rather than "from your [=H+E's] foundation." The possessor is of course not explicit in any of the passages. I am inclined to leave the publ. translations standing, despite their disagreement over the suppressed genitive, but it should be noted that in any of the three a different choice could have been made.

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 explicitly 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*.

Although I have rethought a number of *śrī́-* cmpds with ritual items as first members (see comm. ad III.26.5), including *ghṛta-śrī́-* in other passages (see I.128.4), in this context the intransitive sense seems better.

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 (*dráviṇaṃ ca ... máhi śrávo vā́jam ... 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: *váśunaś 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 *ū*). The VP in 1ab *hiraṇyáyā, bāhū ayaṃsta* is almost entirely matched by 5ab *áyān ... bāhū, 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: On the injunc. *sāvīḥ* in imperatival function see KH, Injunk. 264. He ascribes this usage to the fact that 2nd sg. act. imperatives to *is*-aorists are quite rare.

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. *samudrā́ṇi* in d as an adj. and supply *árṇāṃsi* from c.

VI.72.4: Ge (see also Gr) takes *āmā́su* 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 *āmā́ 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 prāgharmasád*, is clear. Let us work from the end. The rt. noun cmpd. *prāgharma-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 *prā-*

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 *prā́(ḥ)* and (possibly, but see below) de-accenting *dvibárha-*, hence **dvibarhajmā-prā́(ḥ)*. This root noun is common in such cmpds; see, e.g., *antarikṣa-prā́-* 'filling the midspace', *rodasī-prā́-* '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-prā́-* could have led to redactional reanalysis, with segmentation of **prā́*, which was then attached to what follows. However, one problem with my analysis is that it assumes a three-, or indeed four-, member cmpd. **dvibarha-jmā-prā́-*; 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 *carṣaṇīprā́ 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-prā́(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 multi-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 ... cakā́ra*) 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. *bṛ́haspátiḥ* 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 strategem 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, *jīmū́tasya*, 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. *dhánuṣ-*. 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 *kā́ma-* 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 *pārā́yantī* 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 *√sphṝ* 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: *ciścā́*, which is a hapax (though cf. *ciścikṣākāram*, 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 paścā́d 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 'reverently 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.

I would now substitute "flawless" for "blameless" in b; see comm. ad X.61.12.

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 *pūṣā́* 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 *ví* 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.108–9).